

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2901. A bill to authorize the disposition of certain property under the jurisdiction of the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. Res. 254. Resolution directing the Library of Congress to deliver to the Attorney General certain papers; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. MAGNUSON:

H. R. 2902. A bill for the relief of Mrs. William Leo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2903. A bill for the relief of the Washington Asphalt Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PLUMLEY:

H. R. 2904. A bill for the relief of the Reverend R. E. McKinney; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2905. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2906. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Norma S. McKinney and Mrs. Ella Swenson; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1459. By Mr. HALE: Resolution of the New England Traffic League, recommending that the passage of Senate bill 942 as now drawn be opposed; that in lieu thereof the buyers and sellers of all modes of transportation be given the opportunity to confer for the purpose of determining what, if any, illegal or undesirable practices are now being pursued to draft a plan to govern future activities of all rate-making agencies, associations, and bureaus that will be lawful and practicable, such plan to be subject to the approval of Interstate Commerce Commission or such other governmental agency as the Congress may designate, as well as the Department of Justice; and that in order to make effective these recommendations the New England Traffic League urges the Congress and the Department of Justice to defer any action for a reasonable period pending the outcome of these cooperative efforts; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

1460. By Mr. HOPE: Petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1461. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1462. Also, petition with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1463. By Mr. HALE: Petition of 86 members and attendants at the convention of the York County, Maine, Woman's Christian Temperance Union at Berwick, Maine, on May 11, 1943, petitioning Congress to support all legislation which will prohibit the sale of beverage alcohol to the men in or around the camps; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1464. By Mr. NORMAN: Petition of Eliza H. Seany and 37 other citizens of Chehalis, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1465. Also, petition of Mrs. O. L. Soule and 17 other citizens of Elma, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for

the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1466. Also, petition of Christ P. Jacobsen and 56 other citizens of Cathlamet, Wash., and vicinity, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1467. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Resolutions of the Connecticut Valley Pomona Grange, No. 11, Woodstock, Vt., opposing Senate bill 637 as reflecting on the capabilities of the American people to discharge this duty and endangering the freedom of the people; to the Committee on Education.

1468. By Mr. HOLMES of Washington: Petition of sundry citizens of Yakima, Grandview, Mabton, Sunnyside, and Pomeroy, Wash., urging favorable action on House bill 2082, a bill to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war and until the termination of demobilization; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1469. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Francis Jean Reuter, T. D. B. S., M. A., Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to petition No. 221; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1470. Also, petition of the National Society of New England Women, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bills 2428 and 2429; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

1471. Also, petition of the Consolidated Building Trades, Metal Trades, Central Labor Council of Vallejo, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to old-age assistance; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1472. Also, petition of the Council for Pan American Democracy of New York, N. Y., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the colonial system of government be ended in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

1473. Also, petition of the United Federal Workers of America, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Kerr committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Rev. John R. Edwards, D. D., district superintendent of the Methodist Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Father of all mankind, we acknowledge in reverence our dependence upon Thy daily providence. Thy mercies have proved unfailing. We remember, too, the grace of God, which abundantly pardons. In the light of Thy character and faithfulness our human imperfections are reflected. Our personal and national selfishness is registered in narrow conceptions of life and citizenship which hinder Thy holy pur-

poses for human welfare and world brotherhood. We make our confessions and ask Thy forgiveness. May this our repentance be registered in nobler and fuller living. We recognize Thy chastenings, and accept them as expressions of Thy wisdom. Yet our hearts have not fully turned back, neither have our steps declined from Thy way.

Strengthen today every worthy endeavor. Give us increased nobility of heart.

We pray for Thy servants who gather in our legislative halls, the President of the Senate, and others who have chief responsibility.

We pray for our comrades in the task of world brotherhood, especially for those whose lives are exposed to great danger, for their families and all their interests.

May the blessing of God rest this day upon the bereaved family of Thy servant, who had led a great Christian church in our midst, upon his people, and upon all others who mourn his loss.

We pray for the nations of earth who differ from us in thought and purpose. In the midst of strife may we learn nobility of character which shall be free from unholy prejudice and vindictive passion. In the name of the Great Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, June 8, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Megill, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 163) to amend section 511 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, relating to ship construction reserve funds, and for other purposes, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2664) to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 2714) making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in certain appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1943, and for prior fiscal years, and for other purposes; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 8, 37, and 41 to the bill, and concurred therein; that the House receded from its disagreement to the amendment of

the Senate numbered 5 to the bill and concurred therein with an amendment, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate, and that the House insisted upon its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 60 and 61 to the bill.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien;

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209);

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler";

H. R. 2798. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes;

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah," and for other purposes;

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.;

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States;

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities;

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1933, as amended.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Gillette	Murdock
Andrews	Green	Murray
Austin	Guffey	Nye
Bailey	Gurney	O'Daniel
Bankhead	Hatch	O'Mahoney
Barbour	Hawkes	Overton
Bilbo	Hayden	Pepper
Bone	Hill	Revercomb
Buck	Holman	Reynolds
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Russell
Bushfield	La Follette	Scruggs
Byrd	Langer	Shipstead
Capper	Lodge	Smith
Caraway	Lucas	Stewart
Chandler	McCarran	Taft
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Clark, Mo.	McFarland	Thomas, Utah
Connally	McKellar	Tobey
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Tydings
Eastland	Maybank	Vandenberg
Ellender	Mead	Van Nuys
George	Mullikin	Wallgren
Gerry	Moore	Walsh

Wheeler White Willis
Wherry Wiley Wilson

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK], the Senator from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

ACQUISITION, CONVERSION, OR CONSTRUCTION OF CERTAIN AUXILIARY VESSELS FOR THE NAVY—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. WALSH submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 1563) authorizing the acquisition and conversion or construction of certain auxiliary vessels for the United States Navy, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendment numbered 1.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 2; and agree to the same.

DAVID I. WALSH,

M. E. TYDINGS,

JAMES J. DAVIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

P. H. DREWRY,

WARREN G. MAGNUSON,

MELVIN J. MAAS,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PRODUCTION OF FARM MACHINERY

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk be per-

mitted to read a letter which I have just received from Donald M. Nelson, Chairman of the War Production Board, dealing with farm machinery. It is a very short letter.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the clerk will read as requested. The Chief Clerk read as follows:

WAR PRODUCTION BOARD,

Washington, D. C., June 9, 1943.

Hon. SCOTT LUCAS,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SCOTT: I am happy to inform you that a substantially increased program for the production of farm machinery will get under way July 1.

A total of 300,000 tons of carbon steel, with other materials in proportion, has been allocated to the farm machinery program for the quarter beginning July 1. To assure continuous and balanced production, advance authorizations totalling an additional 200,000 tons of steel have also been approved for each of the three quarters from October 1, 1943, to July 1, 1944.

During the third quarter of this year, special emphasis will be given to the manufacture of harvesting machinery for this year's crops.

The total authorizations for the quarter and for the year beginning July 1 will make it possible to meet the farm machinery production program requested by the War Food Administration.

Within a few days the War Production Board will issue a new farm machinery order to replace L-170, under which the industry has been operating. Farm equipment manufacturers are being authorized today by telegram to place orders for materials for the new program. The telegrams include allotment numbers under the Controlled Materials Plan which will make it possible for the companies to place authorized orders immediately. Detailed certificates of authorization will be mailed within a few days.

In order to assure adequate production, distribution, maintenance, and repair facilities, the new order will eliminate the concentration features of L-170. It will provide for production of new machinery at approximately 80 percent of the 1940 level.

The whole farm machinery program has been stepped up by advancing the completion dates for the quotas established in L-170 for the year which began October 1, 1942, and placing the farm machinery industry on a new annual basis beginning July 1. Of the 300,000 tons of carbon steel allotted for the third quarter of this year, 83,723 tons will be used for completion of the increased program of harvesting machinery decided upon in March, and the remainder will constitute first quarter authorizations under the new order.

Sincerely,

DONALD M. NELSON.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

REGISTRANTS DEFERRED FOR OCCUPATIONAL REASONS BY SELECTIVE SERVICE LOCAL BOARDS BECAUSE OF EMPLOYMENT UNDER FEDERAL GOVERNMENT

A letter from the Director of the Selective Service System, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of registrants who have been deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on May 15, 1943, and stating that "a supplemental report will be submitted as soon as possible for those registrants in the 80 remaining local boards in continental United States and the local boards in the Territories of Alaska, Hawaii, and Puerto Rico" (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Military Affairs.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

Two letters from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of papers and documents on the files of the Departments of the Navy (8) and Agriculture (14), and the Executive Office of the President (War Manpower Commission) which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. BREWSTER members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were presented and referred as indicated:

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens of McLouth, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

Petitions of sundry citizens of the State of Maryland, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill, House bill 2082, to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEPPER:

Three memorials of the House of Representatives of the State of Florida; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Memorial 8

"A memorial requesting Congress to continue the appropriation for the work of the Farm Security Administration

"Whereas the Farm Security Administration is rendering a much needed service to a great underprivileged class of our citizens; and

"Whereas no other agency, either governmental or private, will properly assume the task of elevating this large group to financial stability and responsible citizenship; and

"Whereas the need for more and more food and related farm produce will be best served by continuing this worthy agency: Now therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States of America in its wisdom continue the appropriations for the activities of the Farm Security Administration; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida be immediately forwarded by the secretary of State to the President of the United States of America, to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States Congress, to the Secretary of Agriculture of the United States, and copies be forwarded to the delegation representing the State of Florida in both the House and Senate of the United States Congress; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be spread upon the journal in both the house of representatives and the senate of the State of Florida, and that sufficient copies be furnished to the press.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

"House Memorial 10

"Memorial endorsing the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929

"Whereas there has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United

States Congress a bill providing for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929; and

"Whereas it is just and equitable that the persons who suffered loss as aforesaid should be compensated for such loss; and

"Whereas such relief should be provided by an act of the Congress: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

"SECTION 1. That the Legislature of the State of Florida does hereby unanimously endorse the bill that has been introduced in the House of Representatives of the United States Congress for the relief of Floridians who suffered loss in the campaign to eradicate the Mediterranean fruit fly in 1929 and requests the Members of Congress to enact the same into law.

"SEC. 2. That a copy of this resolution be sent to the President of the United States, President of the United States Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to the Florida Members of Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

"House Memorial 14

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States petitioning the Congress to appropriate adequate funds for cooperative forest extension and fire protection and for the continuance of funds for forest research

"Whereas the extension of good forestry practices is essential to the continuing supply of vital forest products; and

"Whereas continuance of cooperative forest fire protection is likewise essential to the future of our forest products; and

"Whereas experimental forest research continues to add to the value of forest and forest products: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Congress be petitioned to appropriate the full amount of \$4,000,000 recommended by the House Agricultural Appropriation Subcommittee and an additional \$3,000,000 to provide fire protection for interior military establishments; and be it further

"Resolved, That Norris-Doxey funds be appropriated to the amount of at least \$500,000 and that the United States Forest Service funds be increased by \$500,000 for the continuance of the experimental forest research; and be it further

"Resolved, That the Secretary of State of Florida be, and he is hereby, directed to send a copy of this memorial under the great seal of the State of Florida to each of the Senators and Representatives of Florida in the Congress of the United States of America.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on Banking and Currency:

"Senate Memorial 2

"Whereas because of unfavorable weather conditions, a late freeze necessitating replanting in many cases and because of increased costs of fertilizer and seed, as well as of labor, and of every other movement incidental to planting, growing, and harvesting this season's crop of Irish potatoes; and

"Whereas the so-called ceiling price of the incoming crop of Florida potatoes, as set by the Office of Price Administration, is not sufficient to meet the added costs, as above enumerated, and is certainly not in line with the prices allowed and named on other essential food products: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved, That the members of the senate and of the house of representatives of the legislature of the State of Florida, do respectfully memorialize and petition the

Office of Price Administration in the recommendation that a substantial increase be ordered in the ceiling price of new Florida potatoes comparable with prices fixed on other vegetable food products, and to make possible a reasonable financial return to the growers to compensate them for their work, time, and labor in food production as a valuable contribution to sustain our citizens, our workers, and soldiers in the all-out effort toward winning the war; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this memorial be transmitted to the Office of Price Administration, the Federal Department of Agriculture, and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from the State of Florida.

"Approved by the governor May 22, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; to the Committee on the Library:

"House Memorial 3

"Memorial to the Congress of the United States requesting that provision be made for the establishment of a national monument at the site of Fort Caroline at St. Johns Bluff, on the south side of the St. Johns River, about 5 miles from the mouth of said river

"Whereas St. Johns Bluff and the area immediately adjacent thereto is of tremendous historical interest, yet has been ignored and neglected by United States Government for some inexplicable reason; and

"Whereas this was the site of Fort Caroline, a colony and fortification established by the French in 1564, was the birthplace of the first Protestant white child on the North American Continent, was the site of the first battle between the armed forces of two European nations in the New World, when the Spaniards, under Pedro Menendez, captured the fort, killing most of the French garrison, and of the battle 2 years later when the French, under DeGourques, recaptured the fort, killing most of the Spanish garrison, and it is probably the only spot in the United States which was actually fortified by five different nations—France, Spain, England, the Confederate States of America, and the United States of America; and

"Whereas this site is a place of great natural beauty: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida, That the Congress of the United States be and it is hereby respectfully requested to establish the Fort Caroline National Monument at St. Johns Bluff, in Duval County, Fla., as a part of the post-war program for recreational centers; be it further

"Resolved, That a copy of this memorial be sent to the President of the United States, and to each of Florida's Senators and Representatives in the Congress of the United States, to the Secretary of the Interior, to the Director of the National Park Service, and to each member of the Advisory Board on National Parks, Historic Sites, Buildings, and Monuments; said copies to be under the great seal of the State of Florida.

"Approved by the Governor May 17, 1943."

A memorial of the Florida Legislature; ordered to lie on the table:

"House Memorial 12

"To the Honorable FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA:

"Whereas it is very necessary that war industry not be stopped for any cause for the duration; and

"Whereas the coal industry is important and vital to the welfare of this country, and to the armed forces, and necessary for our victory over the barbarians of the world; and

"Whereas it is important that workers, miners, and employees at similar work stay on the job; and

"Whereas many miners and other workers have sons and daughters in the armed forces; and

"Whereas it is detrimental to the morale of the armed forces to have workers quit their jobs during this time; and

"Whereas our great President, Franklin D. Roosevelt, has met this emergency with his usual good judgment and appeal to the patriotism of the workingman: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house of representatives and senate concurring, That the President of the United States, Franklin D. Roosevelt, be commended by the Legislature of the State of Florida for his handling of the miner's problem, and for his radio broadcast appeal to the patriotism of the miners, and for his action in the emergency.

"That this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this session, and that a copy be forwarded to the President and our Representatives and Senators in Congress.

"Approved by the Governor May 20, 1943."

RESOLUTIONS OF THE FLORIDA JUNIOR CHAMBER OF COMMERCE

Mr. PEPPER presented resolutions adopted by the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Whereas millions of the flower of American youth are now engaged in a life and death struggle for the very preservation of our system of government; and

Whereas when the complete victory has been accomplished many of these men will return home to begin life anew and will undoubtedly face serious problems of rehabilitation brought on by this global struggle: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual war conference assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., does take cognizance of the foregoing facts and does hereby recommend that the Congress of these United States immediately provide the proper means for the preparation of a competent rehabilitation program to aid and assist these returning civilians of tomorrow to the end that they may once again take their rightful places in our democratic economy.

Whereas the United States of America is now engaged in a total war against the Axis countries; and

Whereas to win this war it is the duty of every person or groups of persons who enjoy the freedom, privileges, and protection of our country to support loyally and patriotically the Government in the all-out effort for victory; and

Whereas a strike during war is a strike against the Government, and regardless of the apparent right to strike such action is dangerous, ill-advised, and unpatriotic, resulting in disunity, crippling of production, and consequent loss of countless lives of our soldiers at the front; and

Whereas John L. Lewis of the United Mine Workers of America called a strike of all miners, thus repudiating a solemn no-strike pledge made to the President of the United States in December 1941: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, The Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce in annual session assembled at Miami Beach, Fla., deplores and condemns this arbitrary, unpatriotic action of John L. Lewis as an effort to force the Government to accede to his demands without submitting to orderly democratic arbitration through the proper Government channels; be it further

Resolved, That the Florida Junior Chamber of Commerce does support and commend the President of the United States as Commander in Chief for reopening production of these vital mines under the flag of the United States of America.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

S. 1158. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 293); and

H. J. Res. 108. Joint resolution commemorating May 15, 1943, as the anniversary of the inauguration of Air Mail Service; without amendment (Rept. No. 294).

By Mr. ANDREWS, from the Committee on the Judiciary:

S. 369. A bill to prevent desecration and mutilation of the flag of the United States; with amendments (Rept. No. 295).

By Mr. McCARRAN, from the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys:

S. 1046. A bill to repeal section 2 of the act entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," approved June 8, 1906; without amendment (Rept. No. 296).

By Mr. PEPPER, from the Committee on Commerce:

H. R. 1403. A bill to authorize the acquisition, improvement, and maintenance of the Gulf County Canal, Fla.; without amendment (Rept. No. 297).

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

H. J. Res. 15. Joint resolution authorizing the appropriation of such sums as may be necessary to pay the proportionate share of the United States in the annual expenses of the Inter-American Financial and Economic Advisory Committee; without amendment (Rept. No. 298); and

H. J. Res. 16. Joint resolution providing for participation by the United States in the Emergency Advisory Committee for Political Defense, and authorizing an appropriation therefor; without amendment (Rept. No. 299).

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

S. 1171. A bill granting an increase of pension to Grizelda Hull Hobson; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 1172. A bill to authorize a payment to the widow and minor children of the late Commander Howard W. Gilmore, United States Navy, as a token of the appreciation of the people of the United States for his heroic sacrifice of his life; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1173. A bill to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 1174. A bill for the relief of William L. O'Brien; and

S. 1175. A bill for the relief of Margaret Barnes Shank; to the Committee on Finance. (Mr. LANGER introduced Senate bills Nos. 1176 to 1216, inclusive, which were referred to the appropriate committees, and appear under separate headings.)

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED OR PLACED ON CALENDAR

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred, or

ordered to be placed on the calendar, as indicated:

H. R. 986. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct; to the Committee on Finance.

H. R. 1289. A bill to repatriate native-born women residents of the United States who have heretofore lost their citizenship by marriage to an alien; to the Committee on Immigration.

H. R. 1947. A bill to extend the time within which a suit or suits may be brought under the act of June 28, 1938 (52 Stat. 1209); to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

H. R. 2250. A bill to extend the provisions of the Reclassification Act of February 28, 1925, to include custodial employees in the Postal Service;

H. R. 2419. A bill to change the name of "laborer" in the Postal Service to that of "mail handler"; and

H. R. 2768. A bill to amend the act entitled "An Act to provide that the United States shall aid the States in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes," approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

H. R. 2527. A bill to amend the description of the area affected by the act of May 28, 1928, entitled "An Act for the relief of the town of Springdale, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

H. R. 2562. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to sell and convey to the State Hospital at Goldsboro, Goldsboro, N. C., a certain tract of land, situated in Wayne County, N. C.; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

H. R. 2663. A bill to provide a penalty for the willful violation of regulations or orders respecting the protection or security of vessels, harbors, ports, or water-front facilities; and

H. R. 2859. A bill to amend the Naval Reserve Act of 1938, as amended; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

H. R. 2750. A bill to amend section 353 (b) of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended; and

H. R. 2612. A bill to extend the effective date of the act of December 17, 1941, relating to additional safeguards to the radio communications service of ships of the United States; ordered to be placed on the calendar.

RESOLUTIONS OF DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS, DEPARTMENT OF NORTH DAKOTA—PROPOSED VETERANS' LEGISLATION—BILLS INTRODUCED

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for the RECORD and appropriate reference a resolution from the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, requesting "First things first." The resolutions committee is composed of Neal E. Williams, chairman, Norman G. Charboneaux, Fred Gonglie, Herb Turner, and Fay DeWitt, all of whom have been officers of the Disabled War Veterans, Department of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution presented by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to uniformize administrative provisions concerning, and to remove, present inequalities as between various similar groups of disabled veterans and their dependents.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted at the convention of the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, setting forth:

That this convention pledge its support to the national organization and go on record before the national organization as recommending that that organization take steps to train and maintain a Veterans' Service representative in each Veterans' Administration facility in the United States, and in States like North Dakota where a Veterans' Service commissioner is maintained by law, said Veterans' Service representative of this organization be instructed to assist such Veterans' Service commissioner.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. LANGER. Also, I present a resolution adopted by the same organization to provide for a method by which able-bodied persons, now performing jobs which can be satisfactorily performed by handicapped persons, can be replaced in such jobs by handicapped persons, including America's disabled defenders, so as to release them for other essential employment or service—important to the Nation's determination to win World War No. 2.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the resolution will be received and referred to the Committee on Finance.

By unanimous consent, Mr. LANGER presented the following resolutions adopted by the Disabled American Veterans, Department of North Dakota, the titles of which were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, and the resolutions were referred as indicated:

To the Committee on Finance:

Resolution requesting that immediate priorities be granted for the enlargement of the Veterans' Administration hospital at Fargo, N. Dak.;

Resolution protesting against the presumption that if a veteran of World War No. 2 does not have more than 6 months' service, that his disability did exist prior to service;

Resolution pledging all members of the Department of North Dakota to purchase War Savings bonds and stamps and other debentures of the Government to promote the war effort;

Resolution authorizing and directing the national service director of the Disabled American Veterans to confer with other national officers and other veteran organizations relative to taking steps looking to the enactment of legislation and provision for such executive orders and other plans as may be designed to provide for the full, suitable, gainful employment of all returning war veterans of World War No. 2;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of permanent partial 10 percent for any war veteran who was wounded or gassed in active service;

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the dependent widows and children of deceased war veterans who, at time of death, were suffering with a disability traceable to an examination, treatment, or hospitalization of such veteran;

Resolution to provide more effective preferences for veterans suffering from service-connected disabilities and for their wives and

widows as to all governmental jobs for which they are qualified;

Resolution to provide an increase in the pension payable to the dependent widows and children of war veterans who at the time of death were suffering from some service-connected disability;

A resolution to provide for continued insurance protection for veterans who have received insurance benefits for 240 months or more, who thereafter have been rated less than permanently and totally disabled;

A resolution to provide that Government insurance policies shall be incontestable, subsequent to one year after date of issuance, reinstatement or conversion and that all premiums paid in on all policies canceled by the Veterans' Administration shall be returned to the veteran or to his next of kin;

Resolution to liberalize the law as to forfeitures;

Resolution to provide that basic ratings of disabilities shall be increased by 20 percent thereof for each additional 5 years of age after the age of 40, in determining the amount of compensation to be granted to service connected disabled veterans;

Resolution requesting legislation, in effect to provide that the amounts of compensation and pension payable to disabled veterans, and the dependents of disabled veterans, shall automatically be increased or decreased by 10 percent for each 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above or below that of the calendar year 1940, to be used as the basic period, provided, however, that such basic compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic rates provided by law;

Resolution to provide for a minimum rating of 1 percent in all cases where a veteran was noted, at time of discharge, as having some disability;

Resolution to provide that so-called "misconduct" shall be a bar to the receipt of compensation or pension to disabled veterans only where the disability was due to "felonious misconduct";

Resolution to provide full compensation for the so-called "presumptives";

Resolution to provide for adjudication of pending claims after death of veteran;

Resolution to permit suit on any automatic, yearly renewable term or United States Life Insurance policy at any time;

Resolution to increase up to \$60 per month the death compensation payable to widows of war veterans who have died by reason of service connected disabilities;

Resolution to provide a pension of \$60 per month to any war veteran who is permanently and totally disabled by reason of a disability not established to be service connected;

Resolution to extend the period of time before which to make application for adjusted compensation from January 2, 1940, up to January 2, 1950;

Resolution to provide for retroactive adjudication of equitable claims;

Resolution to provide for a reduction of interest on Government insurance loans, from 5 percent to 3½ percent;

Resolution requiring that permanent total disability shall be determined on the basis of the inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation;

Resolution requesting removal of all limitation dates before which to make application for various types of benefits for veterans and their dependents;

Resolution to authorize payment of compensation for partial service-connected disability plus the percentage of pension for permanent total disability (nonservice) equal to the difference between 100 percent and his degree of service-connected disability;

Resolution to provide for dependency allowances to be payable to veterans receiving compensation or pension on the basis of permanent ratings;

Resolution to provide full payment of compensation or pension to single veterans while hospitalized;

Resolution to provide eligibility for adjusted compensation to any World War provisional, temporary or probationary commissioned or warrant officer below rank of major;

Resolution to provide that the Veterans' Administration shall not, in the absence of fraud, or clear or unmistakable error, reduce any permanent disability rating;

Resolution to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connections and compensation;

Resolution to provide prosthetic and orthopedic appliances needed for any war veteran;

Resolution to extend the time within which to make an appeal from decisions of rating agencies of the Veterans' Administration;

Resolution to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Veterans' Administration until modified by court order; and

Resolution requesting amendment to National Service Life Insurance Act to provide insurance benefits for total disability.

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

Resolution requesting legislation to provide for the fingerprinting of all persons within the United States;

To the Committee on Military Affairs:

Resolution to remove the Statute of Limitations as to claims for Emergency Officers' Retirement benefits;

Resolution to provide for Army, Navy, and Marine Corps Boards of Appeals and Reviews, with authority to grant honorable discharge certificates to veterans previously discharged dishonorably or without honor;

Resolution to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a National Cemetery in every State; and

Resolution to the Congress, urging enactment of legislation requiring the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps officials to furnish each soldier, sailor, or marine upon discharge or immediately thereafter copy of medical record.

To the Committee on Pensions:

Resolution to provide the same amount of pension for the widows and children and dependent parents of war veterans who were permanently and totally disabled in combat, but who have died by reason of some other disability, as if they had died by reason of such combat disability; and

Resolution to extend eligibility for pension to the widow of any veteran, otherwise eligible, if she was married to and living with the veteran for 2 years immediately preceding his death, or if, being married, she gave birth to a child by the veteran.

Ordered to lie on the table:

Resolution expressing appreciation to Past Commanders C. T. Hoverson and Walter Johnson, manager and veterans' contact officer of Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., and also to Dr. P. A. Waters, Veterans' Bureau, Fargo, N. Dak., for their counsel and guidance on the many problems before the Disabled American Veterans convention.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also ask consent to introduce for proper reference a number of bills prepared by the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and appropriately referred.

(For the bills introduced today by Mr. LANGER, see the end of Mr. LANGER's remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, the first bill is entitled "A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering."

I may add, Mr. President, that the Disabled War Veterans of North Dakota is a very active body, perhaps the most active of any organization in the United States. Realizing that the Disabled War Veterans were not receiving a square deal, and also that some of the other veterans, in their judgment, were not receiving the kind of deal to which they were entitled, they asked that I prepare certain bills for them. Some of these bills they prepared themselves. With respect to others I assisted in the preparation.

The second bill is entitled "A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits."

The third bill is entitled "A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in national service life insurance policies."

The fourth bill is entitled "A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order."

The fifth bill is entitled "A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces."

The sixth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10."

The seventh bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator."

The eighth bill is entitled "A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation Numbered 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities but whose death resulted from other causes."

The ninth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof."

The tenth bill is entitled "A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error."

The eleventh bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers."

The twelfth bill is entitled "A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent."

The thirteenth bill is entitled "A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children."

The fourteenth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize payment of pensions at

combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities."

The fifteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota."

The sixteenth bill is entitled "A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identification cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes."

The seventeenth bill is entitled "A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis."

The eighteenth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability."

The nineteenth bill is entitled "A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ per centum."

The twentieth bill is entitled "A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications."

The twenty-first bill is entitled "A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950."

The twenty-second bill is entitled "A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from \$40 to \$60 per month."

The twenty-third bill is entitled "A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies."

The twenty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to increase to \$60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities."

The twenty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran."

The twenty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 per centum of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 per centum thereof, and for other purposes."

The twenty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct."

The twenty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans."

The twenty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension pay-

ments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 per centum for every 10 per centum increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first six months of 1940, as computed each six months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes."

The thirtieth bill is entitled "A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 per centum of the basic amounts, payable for each five years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes."

The thirty-first bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents."

The thirty-second bill is entitled "A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after one year, and for other purposes."

The thirty-third bill is entitled "A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fourth bill is entitled "A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the act of June 28, 1934 (Public Law Numbered 484, Seventy-third Congress), as amended, and for other purposes."

The thirty-fifth bill is entitled "A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed."

The thirty-sixth bill is entitled "A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment."

The thirty-seventh bill is entitled "A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-eighth bill is entitled "A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions."

The thirty-ninth bill is entitled "A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes."

And the fortieth bill is entitled "A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for

receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War."

Mr. President, I wish to state that, as I have said before, all the bills were carefully drawn by the disabled war veterans of the State of North Dakota. After having gone over them and examined them with experts who have been in touch with the Veterans' Bureau, there does not seem to be any disputing the fact that the disabled war veterans of the United States have not been receiving the kind of treatment to which they feel they are entitled, and to which I think they are entitled, in view of the fact that they were disabled in World War No. 1.

The bills introduced by Mr. LANGER were severally read twice by their titles, and referred, as indicated:

S. 1176. A bill to provide for liberalized adjudication of claims of veterans for service connection for disabilities with which they may be suffering;

S. 1177. A bill to remove limitations on time for making application for veterans' benefits;

S. 1178. A bill to authorize and direct the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to include provision for payment of total disability benefits in National Service Life Insurance policies; and

S. 1179. A bill to amend section 19 of the World War Veterans' Act so as to provide that insurance judgments shall be binding upon the Administrator until modified by court order; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1180. A bill to require the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to furnish copies of medical records to persons discharged from the armed forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1181. A bill to amend paragraph V of Veterans Regulation No. 10;

S. 1182. A bill to amend paragraph III of part II of Veterans Regulation 2 (a) so as to extend the time within which appeals may be taken to the Administrator;

S. 1183. A bill to amend paragraph IV of Veterans Regulation No. 1 (a) so as to provide increased pensions to surviving dependents of deceased veterans who, at the time of their death, were suffering from permanent and total service-connected disabilities, but whose death resulted from other causes;

S. 1184. A bill to authorize the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs to furnish orthopedic or prosthetic appliances to any honorably discharged veteran in need thereof;

S. 1185. A bill to prohibit the reduction of permanent disability ratings except in case of fraud or clear and unmistakable error;

S. 1186. A bill to extend eligibility for adjusted compensation to certain World War provisional, temporary, or probationary commissioned or warrant officers;

S. 1187. A bill to provide full payment of compensation or pension to hospitalized veterans having neither wife, child, nor dependent parent;

S. 1188. A bill to increase the amount of the compensation or pension payable to veterans having service-connected disabilities who have dependent spouses or children; and

S. 1189. A bill to authorize payment of pensions at combined rates to veterans entitled to benefits for both partial service-connected disabilities and permanent total non-service-connected disabilities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1190. A bill to provide for a national cemetery in the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1191. A bill to require certain persons within the United States to carry identifica-

tion cards and be fingerprinted, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S. 1192. A bill to change the definition of permanent total disability for pension purposes, as to World War veterans, so as to base it upon an individual, rather than an average, basis;

S. 1193. A bill to provide that inability of the individual veteran to follow any substantially gainful occupation resulting from service-connected disability shall be deemed to be permanent total disability;

S. 1194. A bill to change interest rates on loans secured by liens on United States Government life (converted) insurance to 3½ percent;

S. 1195. A bill to authorize the Veterans' Administration to correct erroneous adjudications;

S. 1196. A bill to extend the time within which applications for benefits under the World War Adjusted Compensation Act, as amended, may be filed up to January 2, 1950;

S. 1197. A bill to increase the pension payable to war veterans suffering from permanent total non-service-connected disabilities from \$40 to \$60 per month;

S. 1198. A bill to so amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, as to eliminate all statutes of limitations on automatic, yearly renewable term, or United States Government life (converted) insurance policies;

S. 1199. A bill to increase to \$60 per month the amount of compensation otherwise payable to widows of deceased World War veterans whose deaths were caused by their service-connected disabilities;

S. 1200. A bill to provide for adjudication of any claim for compensation, pension, or retirement pay upon evidence in file at time of death of the veteran;

S. 1201. A bill to provide that veterans now receiving compensation for certain so-called presumptive disabilities equivalent to 75 percent of the amount to which they were previously entitled shall henceforth have such compensation restored to 100 percent thereof, and for other purposes;

S. 1202. A bill to define misconduct, for compensation and pension purposes, as limited to felonious misconduct;

S. 1203. A bill providing for the establishment of minimum ratings for disabled World War veterans;

S. 1204. A bill to provide for increasing or decreasing the compensation or pension payments, payable to veterans of all wars, campaigns, and expeditions, or of peacetime service, and to their dependents, under laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, by 10 percent for every 10 percent increase or decrease in the cost of living above the basic cost of living during the first 6 months of 1940, as computed each 6 months, provided that such compensation and pension payments shall not be reduced below the basic amounts provided for under such laws, and for other purposes;

S. 1205. A bill to provide that the compensation or pension of service-connected disabled veterans shall be increased by 20 percent of the basic amounts, payable for each 5 years of age beginning with the fortieth birthday, and for other purposes;

S. 1206. A bill to liberalize existing laws as to forfeitures of rights as to claims for certain benefits by veterans and their dependents;

S. 1207. A bill to provide that Government life-insurance policies shall be incontestable after 1 year, and for other purposes;

S. 1208. A bill to amend the World War Veterans' Act, 1924, as amended, to provide continuation of insurance benefits (under certain conditions) to persons permanently and totally disabled and for other purposes; and

S. 1209. A bill to provide death compensation for dependent parents of deceased World War veterans under the Act of June

28, 1934 (Public Law No. 484, 73d Cong.), as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1210. A bill to give honorably discharged veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans, who themselves are not qualified, preference in employment where Federal funds are disbursed; to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1211. A bill to extend eligibility for compensation to the widows and children of deceased World War veterans who had disabilities caused or aggravated by examination, hospitalization, or medical treatment; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1212. A bill to establish a Board of Appeals and Reviews in the Army for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 1213. A bill to establish boards of appeals and reviews in the Navy and Marine Corps for hearing and passing upon petitions for correction of records of persons discharged under other than honorable conditions; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

S. 1214. A bill to provide for a statutory award of \$10 per month to any war veteran who was wounded, gassed, injured, or disabled by an instrumentality of war in a zone of hostilities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 1215. A bill to liberalize the bases of eligibility for receipt of disability retirement benefits as to emergency, provisional, probationary, and temporary officers of the World War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

ADDITIONAL COMPENSATION FOR POSTAL SERVICE EMPLOYEES

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I also introduce a bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by \$300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act. I introduce the bill for the reason that I find, upon investigation, that the letter carriers and some of the other postal employees are not receiving sufficient pay, in view of the increased cost of living, to enable them to maintain a decent standard of living.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1216) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide temporary additional compensation for employees in the Postal Service," so as to increase by \$300 the amount of additional compensation payable under such act, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

VICTORY ON THE HOME FRONT—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "Victory on the Home Front," delivered by him June 7, 1943, before the Central Retail Feed Association, Inc., at the Schroeder Hotel, Milwaukee, Wis., which appears in the Appendix.]

A CHECK-UP OF THE FOOD FRONT—ADDRESS BY HON. HERBERT HOOVER

[Mr. CAPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address entitled "A Check-Up of the Food Front," delivered by Hon. Herbert Hoover at the American Farm Bureau Federation meeting on June 8, 1943, at the Hotel New Yorker, New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

WORK OF THE TRAFFIC DEPARTMENT, AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF RAIL- ROADS

[Mr. WHEELER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement of the 1937 accomplishments of the traffic department of the American Association of Railroads, which appears in the Appendix.]

WARTIME SUBSIDIES—ARTICLE FROM BUSINESS WEEK

[Mr. MAYBANK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Wartime Subsidies," published in the May 22, 1943, issue of Business Week, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CRITICAL CANNED-FOOD SITUATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I desire the attention of the Senate for a few moments in order to speak on a subject which I believe merits the attention of this body. I have just returned from my State of Wisconsin. There I found a condition which is truly tragic. The canning factories of the country are having difficult times. My State under normal conditions cans about 36 percent of the peas canned in the Nation. If the pea crop in other States this year does not improve, we in Wisconsin may be called upon to can in the neighborhood of from 40 percent to 45 percent of the total crop. The help problem, of course, arises from the war situation. Help in canning factories, which ordinarily would be paid from 40 to 50 cents an hour during the seasonal period, has all been taken into the war plants. In the war plants the workers are paid from \$1.10 an hour up. The result is that we are likely to lose a great deal of very vital food. How important is that food? Mr. President, let me refer to an article I have before me which was published by the Milwaukee Journal, reprinted from the New York Times. The article indicates that the defeat in Tunisia of the Germans and Italians was due in no small measure to the fact that the Germans were undernourished. They had plenty of food, mind you, but they did not have the cooked food. They had plenty of ammunition. What they lacked was the nourishment which comes from cooked food, canned food. Our boys who did such a fine job had canned, cooked food.

I simply want to take a moment to read a paragraph or two from the article. The article was written by Frank L. Kluckhohn:

But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees, at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

Now let me read another paragraph:

Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked

of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed.

They did not talk of victory before they were fed. They surrendered. After they had received a square meal of American rations, cooked rations, they talked of victory, the article says.

The paragraph concludes:

A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over.

Mr. President, last week, before I returned to my State, there came to my office representatives of the canneries of the State. They were rather dejected. They want to do all they can do. I put them in contact with Marvin Jones. One of the issues is, Can they raise their wage 10 cents an hour? Since the men in the plants in the neighborhood are receiving \$1.10 an hour, where else would anyone want to work? However, this problem involves more than the interests of the canners, more than the interests of the State of Wisconsin. It goes to the very question of whether we shall win the war. Food will win. The lack of food will defeat us.

I read a paragraph from a letter which I received this morning from William Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co., who is a patriotic citizen:

We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war. No food and you need no shells, cannon, tanks, airplanes. You can kill more people by starvation than any mechanical device that man can produce.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WILEY. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. In connection with the matter which the Senator is discussing, let me say that I received two letters from the parents of boys in New Guinea. One of them wrote to his folks saying that he could not understand why the people in the United States were being rationed. He said that the boys were not getting any American food. He said that they were getting Australian beef, which was rather poor, but 10 American canned goods. He said that the Australian canned beans and some other articles were all right, but that most of the canned goods were of very poor grade. This soldier, writing to his parents, said that he had not been paid for 5 months. He said that the boys could buy all the American food they wanted in the canteens, but that they were not being furnished American food.

I took up the question with the War Department and was informed that the Department would immediately take it up by wire with the authorities in New Guinea. The War Department officials said that there was no reason why the boys should not get American food.

As I have said, I received two letters, one from a boy's parents in Billings, Mont., and one from a boy's parents in Helena, Mont. Both of them told exactly the same story.

So far as the farmers in my State are concerned, I have received no complaint from them with reference to the prices of their products; but there is this question: If we are to get plenty of food we must have labor. I read a statement by Mr. Hoover and one by the Governor of New York to the effect that they fear that there will be a food shortage. Other persons have told me that there is bound to be a food shortage. If we are to bring about a greater production of canned goods, we must have labor. We must give the farmer a price such that he can furnish the materials with which to produce the food. It seems to me it is a short-sighted policy to say that we will not give the farmer or the canner a price sufficient to pay his workers so that the workers can be kept on the farm or in the factory.

Complaints in similar vein to the complaint cited by the Senator from Wisconsin have come from the canners of my State.

Mr. WILEY. I thank the distinguished Senator. I do not know whether our canned goods are going through to Australia. I do know that under the lend-lease arrangement Australia is giving a great deal of food to our boys there. Lend-lease there is a two-way street, and, so far as I know, there is no complaint as to the quality or quantity of food which the boys are getting.

I am not speaking on that point. I am stressing the point that the Senate of the United States can no longer "pass the buck." For some years we have been talking about the need of a war cabinet. We have sensed that an over-all authority was needed. We need someone at the head who can make the final decision. We hoped that when Jimmie Byrnes was appointed as "assistant President" the war cabinet would go into action. The trouble in the past has been that someone decides what the wages shall be; someone else decides this thing or that thing, but they are in different departments, and there is no person having over-all authority. Here is hoping Byrnes will coordinate this whole matter—wages, prices, priorities, and so forth.

Mr. President, in the next few weeks the question of whether or not certain crops are to be preserved in this country must be decided. It will be decided by the action which is taken in relation to providing labor for the factories.

Three weeks ago when I was in the West there had been heavy rains in Indiana, Ohio, and other States. Much of the land was under water. On my return trip yesterday and this morning I was glad to see that a great deal of that land is coming through in fine shape. Of course, the corn is behind. That means a delay in canning and production in that area.

However, let me stick to the point which I am making. I repeat the language of Mr. Opitz, of the Elkhorn Canning Co.:

We must make Washington realize, before it is too late, that canned foods are the No. 1 munition of war.

What are we going to do? What is Congress going to do about it? What is

Marvin Jones going to do about it? What are the authorities at the other end of the Avenue going to do? Are they going to neglect the problem? If they do, we may find our boys in the same situation as were the Germans in north Africa. They had plenty of munitions, plenty of food, but not plenty of guts. Why? Because they did not have cooked food.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the article to which I have referred be printed in its entirety in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GERMANS WILL QUIT! LESSON OF TUNISIA—THEY WERE NOT OUT OF AMMUNITION OR FOOD, BUT WHEN THEY SAW THEY WERE TO BE DEFEATED THEY CAVED IN QUICKLY

(By Frank L. Kluckhohn)

ALLIED HEADQUARTERS IN NORTH AFRICA.—Why did the German and Italian troops in Africa suddenly collapse after 6 months of sturdy battling against the Allied forces? In the answer to this question one can find many lessons of prime importance for the future. All of us who saw the Germans in action knew that technically they were as expert as any troops could be. They used tanks, artillery and antitank guns, men, and airplanes almost perfectly. They seemed to those opposing them to be as courageous as any soldiers that could be found. Yet suddenly they went to pieces. Why?

The Germans were beaten militarily by superior fire power. They were mauled by Allied planes with complete control of the air, but this does not tell the whole story. This is that they collapsed, that they gave up when they saw the odds were overwhelmingly against them. When it came to the showdown they did not after all have the inspiration of the men of Bataan, the willingness to die for a lost cause and gain vital time, that the Russians showed at Stalingrad. There was something wrong. We know what it was and that is the point of this report.

NOT A MATTER OF NUMBERS

When it is said they bowed to superior fire power, that does not mean they were overwhelmed by numbers. The official count of prisoners shows that 200,000 Axis soldiers, at least two-thirds of them Germans, were captured, in addition to those who died, row on row, as the Americans drove into Bizerte and the British into Tunis. In the actual line, Gen. Sir Harold R. L. G. Alexander probably did not have a number greatly in excess of that.

Thousands of pieces of artillery of all types, hundreds of intact implements of warfare like tanks were taken. The odds were not terribly uneven on paper. When one talks of superior fire power one means that the Allied tanks were better concentrated than the German, that the American artillery and British, too, were far more effective than that of the enemy, that our boys were willing to die—and many of them did—to bring to bear the small-arm fire necessary to get to their objective. These were Allied troops—British, American, French—seasoned by long months of fighting the Germans, to beat them at their own game.

OUTGENERATED ARNIM AND CAPTURED HIM

That only steel thrown faster than the Germans can hurl it would beat the superb masters of warfare most informed Americans have long known, but when the Germans came in as prisoners and asked to see our "automatic" big guns, it showed that the novel American method of employing artil-

lery had them on their heels. When our Infantry charge sheer 2,000-foot cliffs and drove the Germans out it was because they could throw more lead than the enemy in a superior position.

When Col. Gen. Jurgen von Arnim was captured not so far from Enfidaville, it demonstrated that he had been outgeneraled—General Alexander had held important elements of the Axis army there by the mere name of the Eighth Army, while he transferred three of its divisions to the First Army farther north for the knock-out blow.

It is indeed good news that we can outshoot, outfright, and outgeneral the opposition. No one here thinks that the inevitable entry into Europe is going to be anything but hard or that the battle afterward is going to be any easier than the long, difficult struggle in Tunisia. It is dangerous to be over-optimistic because of what has happened.

NAZI INVINCIBILITY?

But in this Tunisian campaign we have shown that the Germans can be beaten in their chosen field—battle—just as they were in 1918. We have proved that Nazi invincibility is a myth.

We have learned, moreover, all the Nazi tricks in using tanks, placing guns, and employing whatever one has most effectively. After we had learned what the Germans knew, we improved our methods and invented tricks of our own.

But what we are most interested in here is that, far from fighting to the last cartridge, these Germans surrendered with boxes of ammunition in quantity, neatly stacked under trees at Cap Bon. And that they marched in with enough food to last them a long while—our chief difficulty in feeding them with it has been that their rations are uncooked, whereas most of our front-line rations come prepared in cans. It was not alone that the Germans marched in briskly in military formations to give themselves up rather than face the destruction of their outfits to save time for Adolf Hitler, who sent troops into Africa as late as May 5.

What is important also is that Prussian generals tried to escape in small boats, or burst into tears after capture; that Germans marched in making the "V" for victory sign, hoping this would please the British and Americans; that others fought over the chance to get away in the limited number of small boats available—most of which subsequently were destroyed; that, in brief, they cracked.

LIKE A FOX ROMMEL RAN

Maybe Field Marshal Gen. Erwin Rommel, who left his men at some time yet to be definitely determined, was ill. That would be a natural thing for the German propaganda machine to say of this national idol. Marshal Rommel was the fox—and like the fox, he ran. Generals have commanded battles from a litter.

No one can minimize the tremendous part the British Navy and Allied air forces played in keeping supplies away from the Axis here, yet the forces of Der Fuehrer and Il Duce had ammunition and food when they gave in. It is on the record that a week was counted on to get from Medjez el Bab to Tunis, yet it took only a day and a half after the planes blasted a way open, smashing gun and infantry positions with concentrated bombing. But the Russians have taken the same sort of bombing, and I saw British and American troops stand up against hourly bombings for days on end in the early stages of this campaign.

Let us boil it down to a fact that the Germans did not fight well with the odds against them. Many of them, moreover, were the Germans who appeared to many invincible when they crushed Poland, France, and Greece with the odds in their favor. That is what it comes down to. When the typical

German becomes convinced that he cannot win, he will not fight.

NOT LIKE OUR MEN

Can the reader imagine American troops surrendering by units and when they found that the enemy did not have men available to guard them, marching docilely to the rear? I remember those Hampshire men who died in such numbers near Tebourba that only a few were left. They did not yield a yard. This was against superior numbers with no support in sight. I remember the Americans at Kasserine, out on their feet from weeks of steady and unfavorable fighting, men who thought strongly, perhaps, that they were being misused, who stood their ground though many were killed, and finally turned the tide.

Most of the Hitlerites were despondent when they came in. After a square meal many of them expressed the view that they were going to beat us in the war. The way they had acted was forgotten. They talked of being "tired" of war when they came in. They talked of victory after being fed. A major, who had entered the German Army when he was 15, said he was glad to have his fighting over. Someone asked, "When will the war be over?"

LACKS REAL CONVICTION

"I cannot say," he replied in English. "It may take us 5 or 6 months to recapture Africa."

Summing up, from what I can gather the German has been schooled in war and has fought until his enthusiasm has gone. He is a perfect soldier with regard to technique, both individually and en masse. He is brave enough when he thinks he stands a chance to win, but he lacks the conviction of men with real ideals. He seems to have none of the will to fight when all appears lost that sometimes turns defeat into victory, or at least into glory.

It does not really matter what these men think of Herr Hitler. It is important that the Hitler system has not given them "what it takes."

Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower said this week the Allies could find "hope" in what has happened here. We who have seen something of the dirt and blood, who have felt the extreme discomforts of front-line life, who know the nerve-shattering effects of today's high explosives, who have watched the Germans fight, know we have a long, hard row ahead, but we know that if we can pay the price the German military machine will crack. It may be expected to be a high price, but the Nazis will not fight to the bitter end.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATIONS

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2481) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1944, and for other purposes.

The **PRESIDING OFFICER** (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). The clerk will state the next committee amendment passed over.

The **CHIEF CLERK**. On page 89 it is proposed to strike out lines 4 to 14, inclusive, as follows:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and

means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert in lieu thereof:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semi-annually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making my grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act, \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 percent per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 percent of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to

have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in view of the fact that the question of subsidies was discussed yesterday on the floor of the Senate, and is being generally discussed by a great many persons throughout the country, I wish to call attention to an editorial appearing in the Chicago Daily News of June 3, 1943.

It will be recalled that the publisher of the Chicago Daily News is the Secretary of the Navy, a member of the Cabinet.

The editorial states:

IT BUTTERS NO PARNSIPS

The Office of Price Administration's roll-back on retail butter prices is hailed as a blow at the rising cost of living. The housewife who paid 46 cents a pound for butter can now buy the same grade for 41 cents. It's wonderful. It's all done with mirrors.

In order to accomplish this boon to suffering humanity, the butter producer or wholesaler is forced by law to sell the butter to the retailer at 5 cents a pound less than the former price.

I do not know of any law which requires it. I think it is an edict of the department.

The editorial continues:

He, in turn, will be subsidized by the Government at the rate of 5 cents a pound. He will make as much money on the transaction as formerly, the new dealers point out; the retailer will make as much as formerly; the consumer will be benefited by a saving of 5 cents a pound. It is as simple as all that. But is it?

That 5-cents-a-pound subsidy paid to the wholesaler must come from somewhere. Can it be possible that it comes, via the United States Treasury, out of the pockets of the taxpayers of the country—the people who buy butter and those who can't afford butter but have to be content with oleomargarine? Could be.

And what about the elaborate machinery that will have to be set up to enforce and administer this system, police the retailers and the wholesalers, keep the accounts, write out the subsidy checks, deliver them to the wholesalers, compile the reports and statistics inevitable in such a Nation-wide activity? Will this complicated machinery require the employment of many clerks and accountants and stenographers and typists and regional directors and superdirectors? The answer is, "Yes." And will these Government employees be paid salaries and wages for their services? You said it, brother, they will.

The roll-back is, therefore, merely an optical illusion. The consumer, instead of paying 46 cents a pound for butter over the counter, will pay 41 cents over the counter. Then, sooner or later, he will pay out of another pocket the 5-cent subsidy that goes to the wholesaler, plus a few cents additional in taxation to pay for the army of Government employees necessary to administer the device.

Instead of rolling back the price of butter and lowering the cost of living, the subsidy plan, by increasing the administrative load that the consumer must support, will increase the ultimate cost of butter.

The Office of Price Administration may call it a roll-back now; but eventually it will be a kick-back.

I wish to compliment the Secretary of the Navy for this very able editorial

which appears in his newspaper, the Chicago Daily News.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I agree with the Senator from Montana that the editorial is an able one; but the Senator does not believe that the Secretary of the Navy really wrote the editorial, or knew it appeared, or had anything to do with it, does he?

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he wrote it or not.

Mr. HILL. My understanding is that since Mr. Knox became Secretary of the Navy he turned the management of his newspaper and its policies, as well as its program, over to certain of his partners and employees. So I really think the Senator, however much he might agree with the editorial, is according the Secretary of the Navy a tribute which I doubt the Secretary of the Navy deserves in this particular instance. I question whether the Secretary of the Navy had anything to do with the editorial.

Mr. WHEELER. I do not know whether he had anything to do with it, and I do not believe that my friend, the acting majority leader, knows whether he had anything to do with it. But, whether he had anything to do with it or not, I agree with the editorial thoroughly, and if the Secretary of the Navy was responsible for it, he should be complimented for it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I think in fairness to the Secretary of the Navy it should be said that merely because the editorial is a good one it should not be assumed that the Secretary of the Navy did not write it. [Laughter.]

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the Senator from Michigan, being a newspaperman, ought to know that.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, in addition to what the Chicago Daily News has said in the editorial which I have just read, I wish to say that I am opposed to the granting of subsidies on another ground. I am not saying this because it is being done by a Democratic administration. I am opposed to it in principle. Sooner or later the people of this country must realize that when prices are rolled back and subsidies are granted the money for such subsidies must come out of the pockets of the people in the way of taxes. I agree with the statement made in the editorial that there will have to be provided another army of Federal employees and bureaucrats to check up on all the various stores. The final result will be that it will cost the American people more money than it would cost to permit the consumers to continue to pay the prices which they are paying at the present time.

Furthermore, subsidies are bad in theory, a bad principle, in a democratic republic, because politicians, whether they be Republicans or Democrats, will say to farmers, merchants, and this group and that group, "If the opposition comes into power, you will not receive this subsidy." If various groups of the people are put under obligation to the Government, sooner or later, if this program

continues and this group is to be subsidized and that group is to be subsidized, and some other group is to be subsidized, it will not be long before all the people of the country will be on some kind of a subsidy. When that is done the principles of democracy in a democratic republic will be in danger.

Other forms of government may do it. It has been pointed out that England has done it. But it must be recalled that the British Isles are a much smaller territory than this vast country of ours.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. It also ought to be realized that the British Government is the importer of 90 percent of the food which the people there eat; and, of course, it is easy for that Government, as the importer of 90 or 95 percent of the food products coming into Great Britain, to grant a subsidy by a reduction in the price to the food distributors. But that is no reason why it would work in a country such as ours, under a proposal which seeks to deal with the production and processing of food products. It seems to me that those who have assumed that, because it works in Great Britain to check inflationary price rises, it would work in this country, have wholly left out of consideration the vast difference between what is here proposed and the situation in England.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I agree with the observations of the Senator from Georgia. I should like to invite the attention of the Senator from Montana to this aspect: The sinister part of the subsidy program is that the administration is not coming to the Congress for authority to pay subsidies. It is going to the R. F. C., and the various other corporations which have been created by the Government. A subsidy program has already been instituted in this country when Congress on at least two occasions, has said that no subsidy should be paid.

Furthermore, when Mr. Jesse Jones was before the Joint Committee for the Reduction of Nonessential Federal Expenditures he testified that the R. F. C., without any authority of law whatever, had already agreed to pay \$450,000,000 in subsidies on meat and butter, to the processors, not to the farmers. The big packers are the ones who are to receive the subsidies.

The Senator is probably aware that some time ago Mr. Henderson testified it would cost \$5,000,000,000 to put the subsidy program in operation. It will result in complete regimentation of all the farmers and processors of food. As the Senator has said, the \$5,000,000,000 must be raised through taxation of future generations at a time when they will be less able to pay than are the people today.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator from Georgia called attention to the fact that the situation in England is different from ours

because most of its food is imported. I think it should be stated that a large part of the food imported is obtained through lend-lease from the United States Government, and that the food is then sold to the British people. Pounds sterling are received by the British Government, which, of course, are of no value to us, and are not paid to us. They are available to the British to pay subsidies on foodstuffs acquired elsewhere than in the United States. So not only is the situation different in England, but the subsidy there is paid at our expense instead of that of the British Government.

I wish to call attention to the fact that there is a bill on the calendar, Senate bill 1108, Calendar No. 289, which has been reported by the Committee on Banking and Currency, containing an amendment prohibiting the use of funds of the Commodity Credit Corporation for the payment of subsidies. When that bill comes before the Senate I intend to offer, if no other Senator does, an amendment imposing a general prohibition against the use of R. F. C. money, or any other money, for subsidies, except under certain specified conditions, where Congress may have approved the policy, or where it may desire to approve the policy. I hope the Senator from Montana will support such a movement which will bring this question directly to issue in the Congress of the United States.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator need not worry about my supporting it, for I certainly shall do so.

I also call attention to the fact that when subsidies are granted to various industries and various sections people who may never use the particular article are called upon to pay their share of the subsidy so that someone else may obtain the article at a cheaper price. Take, for instance, a subsidy on coal and oil for New England. The question came up in the Senate in connection with a bill proposing to pay subsidies, and it was shown that because we had loaned or given to England a number of our oil tankers it was impossible to ship oil to New England by tankers, but it had to be shipped by rail. Under that bill subsidies are being granted so that the people of New England can get cheaper oil.

I wish also to call attention to the fact—

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I shall yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to the fact that the people of Montana who already pay a higher price for their gasoline and oil than the people of New England pay are going to have to pay the subsidy or a part of the subsidy which goes to the people of New England. The same thing is true of coal. I point that out as an illustration of how bad subsidies are and what a sinister influence they are on the people of this country as a whole.

Now I yield to the Senator from Massachusetts.

Mr. LODGE. The Senator realizes, of course, that there have been times when there was no oil or coal at any price in New England.

Mr. WHEELER. I so understand.

Mr. LODGE. I hope the Senator does not really mean that it is a sinister thing for the Government to give a little assistance to a section of the country whose productive facilities, leaving out of consideration for the moment human beings, are entirely necessary to the war effort. I cannot believe that the Senator really thinks that New England has received any special favoritism at the hands of the Government, for if he does think so, I am sure he will find that there is no one in New England who agrees with him.

Mr. WHEELER. I appreciate the fact that New England has been badly hit by reason of the shortage of coal and the shortage of oil, and, coming from New England myself, I sympathize very greatly with the people of New England. But I am pointing out the effect of subsidies generally. When subsidies are given on one article to one section of the country, then the rest of the people have to pay for the cheaper product the subsidized section is getting when they themselves derive no benefit from the subsidy at all.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a moment?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. I think one of the cases where a subsidy is justified is on the ground that, because of war conditions, certain transportation costs have greatly increased. That situation affects the people in different sections of the country in different ways. For instance, a plant may be using coal in making war products in Pittsburgh with no increased cost for coal at all, whereas a plant in New England has a very large increase solely due to the war. I think the one exception I would make to the general prohibition against subsidies is a provision that the Government may equalize the cost of transportation where inequality arises because of war emergency conditions. I think in such a case it is not really a subsidy to the particular people involved, but rather an attempt to nullify the inequality caused by war conditions between different people.

Mr. WHEELER. I am perfectly willing to agree that, if there is any instance where a subsidy should be given, it is in the particular instance referred to by the Senator from Ohio. On the other hand, I point out that in my State, for instance, and in some of the other Northwestern States, oil is produced in those States, but notwithstanding the fact that we produce oil and cement and other articles, we have to pay on sugar, for instance, the San Francisco price plus freight to Billings, Mont., right where the sugar factory is located, where the beets are grown. Likewise we pay on oil, which is taken out of the ground in Montana, the Oklahoma price plus the freight to Montana. The same thing is true of various other articles produced in that State. Those States are not only being discriminated against at this time but they are discriminated against at all times. That is why, let me say to Senators from New England, the people of my State are asking, Why should a subsidy be given to New England? Why should

a subsidy be given to this section or that section when we are already paying a higher price than they are paying and when of necessity we will have to help pay the taxes in order to provide the subsidies? That is an illustration of the effect of subsidies generally upon various groups of people and upon various sections of the country.

I say that, in principle, a subsidy by the Government of the United States is wrong and is bound, in my judgment, to have a kick-back, as the editorial in the Chicago Daily News points out. Under any theory of government, the principle of subsidies, in my judgment, cannot be defended.

I condemn the action of the R. F. C. in providing funds for subsidies, and of the administration when in order to pay subsidies, money is taken out of the R. F. C. and out of the Treasury of the United States. It amounts to the same thing, for taking it out of the R. F. C. means taking money, the taxpayers' money, out of the Treasury of the United States, without any appropriation by the Congress of the United States and without any law.

As I pointed out, some people say that England is paying subsidies. After all, if England is doing something, that is no reason why the United States should do it. I have heard it repeatedly stated on the floor of the Senate that we ought to do a certain thing because it is what England is doing; we even hear it stated, "This is what Germany is doing, and, consequently, we have got to do the same thing." We are taking a leaf out of the book of Mr. Hitler and out of other books, and saying that the people of the United States have to take certain action because some other country has taken it.

Mr. SMITH. Mr. President—

Mr. WHEELER. I yield to the Senator from South Carolina.

Mr. SMITH. I have noted statements that different committees are against subsidies, and I take it from the sentiments expressed here that the Senate is against them. Then, why is there not presented a bill to notify the administration and our people that, so far as the general principle of subsidy is concerned, we will legislate against it? The question has arisen before different committees. The question of the butter and meat subsidy is before my committee. The testimony which was given against a subsidy on those products was amazing. Here we are talking about subsidies; committees are investigating the subject but nothing is done, and in the meantime subsidies are in operation. Why not stop it now?

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, I understand that there is a bill now pending before the Senate and on the calendar which, if enacted, would prevent the use of money by the R. F. C., and, as I understood him a few moments ago, the Senator from Ohio said that if no other Senator does so, he intends to offer an amendment to that bill prohibiting all subsidies of every kind and character.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Montana yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I wish to say that, so far as I know, there has been no application to the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate for the money with which to pay a subsidy, but a few days ago, as the Senator from Virginia has just explained, the Secretary of Commerce, Mr. Jesse Jones, whom we all know and whom we all like and admire, came before the Byrd committee and told us very frankly that \$450,000,000 had been set aside to pay subsidies on beef and butter, as I recall, or meat and butter. We asked him to whom he was going to pay the subsidy, whether he was going to pay it to the producers. He was rather vague, as I recall. I have sent for the testimony so as to put his exact words in the RECORD, in order that there may not be any mistake about it, since I would not want to do him an injustice. The answer in substance was, however, that they were going to pay the subsidy to the meat packers.

Mr. WHEELER. The Senator is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I asked him what about the producers. He said the producers would get the benefit of it, as I recall the testimony, by the stabilization of prices. In other words, that through the \$450,000,000 which the Government would turn over to the packers, in some way, somehow, by some method I could not understand—if it can be done in the way explained I am unable to understand it—the producers would indirectly get the benefit by not having to take a lower price for their products. To my mind the payment of \$450,000,000 to the packers of the country, as indicated in the statement given us by Mr. Jones, will be merely a kindly, agreeable, costly gift by the Government to the packers.

Mr. WHEELER. I thank the Senator.

Mr. SMITH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. SMITH. When the question of the roll-back was before a subcommittee of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry a point was brought out by the Senator from Oregon to which I should like to call attention. A question was asked as to how much wages had increased in the last 2 years, as I recall the question. The answer was that they had increased 100 percent. Then the question was, "How much have farm prices increased?" The answer was "22 percent." Mr. Jones was asked, "Do you not think that with this tremendous advance in wages a pay-as-you-go plan might be inaugurated, and that those who are getting this tremendous increase in wages should pay the 46 cents which the Department of Agriculture has fixed, rather than reduce the price to 41 cents, and pay the processor?" We said, "Which do you think would be better, to have the one who receives increased wages pay that out of his 100 percent increase, and leave the producers of milk and cream to get 46 percent?" Mr. Jones' answer was, "You have me cornered."

Mr. WHEELER. Certainly; of course he could not say anything else but that he was cornered. I can understand that there may be a few articles which here-

tofore have not been produced in this country and which our people have been denied because of the war, and which it is necessary to produce here, and that it might be necessary to give subsidies in order to encourage the planting of some new crop which the farmers have not heretofore produced, and perhaps they do not know whether they can produce them at the price fixed.

Mr. SMITH. And the Government pay for the experiment.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes; in other words, let the Government pay for that particular experiment. But to give a subsidy on butter, to give a subsidy on meat products, to give subsidies on this and on that, in my judgment, is absolutely wrong and should not be permitted by this Government.

Mr. President, I hope that Congress will do something about this matter and that the Congress will pass a law prohibiting the money of the R. F. C. being used for the purpose of paying subsidies unless request is made of Congress and a law is passed by the Congress permitting that sort of thing to be done.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. When Mr. Jones testified before the Joint Economy Committee it appeared that, in addition to the \$450,000,000 for subsidy payments on meat and butter, he was already paying the following subsidies annually:

Petroleum and petroleum products.....	\$225,000,000
Sugar.....	17,805,000
Coal.....	25,000,000
Chilean nitrate.....	3,250,000
Fiber.....	1,100,000
Petroleum coke.....	250,000
Aluminum rods and bars.....	250,000

In addition to that he has agreed to pay excess production costs on copper and some other commodities of which he did not have an estimate of the cost. So we have already embarked upon the subsidy policy. He has agreed to pay premiums for the domestic production of copper, lead, and zinc in excess of the 1941 production, at an estimated cost of \$30,000,000 each year.

Mr. WHEELER. I find a widespread opinion that because the subsidy is being paid out of the Treasury of the United States, or is being paid by the R. F. C., the people are getting the benefit of it but will not have to pay for it. They think it is possible to take it out of the so-called rich men of the country. They do not realize that, after all, the taxes have to come out of all classes of people, either directly or indirectly, and that if we took all the money of all the so-called ultrarich, there would not be enough money to pay the interest upon our bonded indebtedness at the present time.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. McKELLAR. I now have Mr. Jones' testimony before me, and I read from page 1135:

The CHAIRMAN. What I mean is this \$450,000,000, how are you going to get it back to

Tom Jones who sells the hogs over 3 or 4 months, how does he get his part of it?

Secretary JONES. He will get his part of it, because the packer will continue to pay the prevailing prices.

The CHAIRMAN. It all goes to the packer then?

Secretary JONES. No; it does not go to the packer.

Senator McKELLAR. Who ultimately receives it?

Secretary JONES. It reaches the animal man.

I judge he means the man who produces the animal.

Senator McKELLAR. Who actually receives the money?

Secretary JONES. The packer, the producer.

Mr. WHEELER. Of course, the packer gets it. He does not give it back to the producer of the animal.

Mr. McKELLAR. Let me finish the quotation:

Senator McKELLAR. The packer actually receives it?

Secretary JONES. Yes.

Senator McKELLAR. It depends on whether or not anybody else gets it.

Secretary JONES. I would not think so.

There he admits that the producer of the meat gets no part of the money, but that the packer gets the money, and that in some way, by the stabilization of prices, keeping prices where they are now, the producer will get the benefit. There is a ceiling on the price.

Mr. WHEELER. What I assume he means is that the packers were saying that they were being squeezed because they could not afford to pay the prices which had been fixed by the O. P. A. to the stock growers, and then process the product at the price at which they were required to sell it.

So in order to stabilize the price, in order to give the consumer a cheaper price, the packer was given a subsidy. I do not know whether the packer is today receiving a sufficiently high price for his product, but let us assume that he is not receiving the price he ought to receive. Some persons in the United States eat more meat than do others. Some persons do not eat any meat. Some persons require more meat than others. The payment of the subsidy means that the person who does not eat any meat and the person who eats very little meat will be asked to pay taxes in order that the person who eats more meat can have cheap meat. The same thing applies all the way down the line. Some families possibly cannot buy butter because they cannot afford to pay the price for it, and therefore must use oleomargarine. If some families must use oleomargarine because they cannot afford to buy butter, they either directly or indirectly are obliged to pay taxes in order that others may be enabled to buy butter at a lower price.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. WHEELER. I yield.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. Byrd] a moment ago stated that lead, copper, and zinc receive subsidies. Of course they are in a different category altogether from but-

ter, cream, and beef, for the reason that the Government is the only purchaser of zinc, lead, and copper, and these metals are being used altogether in the war effort. The subsidies which are being paid for the production of these metals go only to new producers. Old producers of copper, lead, and zinc, who were operating prior to the war, receive no subsidies whatever for what they produce. The subsidy, or incentive payment, is given only to the new producers.

Mr. BYRD. That was not the testimony which Mr. Jones gave, although I agree with the Senator from Colorado that the metals present an entirely different question. Mr. Jones testified that premiums are paid for domestic production which is in excess of the 1941 production.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. I asked Mr. Jones the specific question if it would not apply to the Anaconda Copper Co., and he said it would.

Mr. WHEELER. I think Secretary Jones is wrong in that respect. The subsidy would apply to that company only as it developed some new property.

Mr. BYRD. No; the Secretary said that for production which was in excess of 1941 production the company would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. No; that statement is wrong for the reason that the Anaconda Copper Co. is not producing as much now as it did in 1941.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Montana spoke of new producers. If the Anaconda Copper Co. were to produce more now than it produced in 1941 it would be eligible to receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. It would not necessarily have to be a new producer. An old producer who increased his production over that of 1941 would receive a subsidy.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Certain regulations are drawn around that provision, however.

Mr. BYRD. I am not objecting to that particular form of subsidy. I am simply calling attention to what the Secretary said.

Mr. WHEELER. The Government has fixed the price of copper at 14 cents. During the last war the price of copper was 27 cents. Perhaps the price of copper was too high at that time. At this time an increase in price of copper has been sought by producers. Rather than grant a general increase in the price of copper a subsidy has been provided to be paid only for copper produced in mines or portions of mines which were not previously producing to any great extent. With respect to the production of main mines I am quite sure that under the present rules and regulations the producers receive no subsidies.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator yield once more so the RECORD may be made absolutely correct?

Mr. WHEELER. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. I find an additional statement in the hearings with reference to the \$450,000,000:

The CHAIRMAN. All the farmer gets is the fact that his price is not reduced.

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

The CHAIRMAN. He gets the same price that he now gets?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. McKELLAR. I continue to read:

Secretary JONES. That is correct.

Senator McKELLAR. The subsidy goes to the packer, the processor, and the distributor.

The Secretary did not answer my last statement, but it was made in connection with the general discussion. I call attention to that testimony in order to show that so far as this enormous subsidy of \$450,000,000 is concerned every dime of it, every cent of it, goes to the packer or to the distributor. Not a single cent of it goes to the farmer who produces the meat or the butter.

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct.

Mr. BYRD. Let me say that the \$450,000,000 represents simply the beginning of the subsidy program.

Mr. WHEELER. Yes, of course; it is simply the beginning of it. Anyone who knows anything about subsidies must be aware that if we begin giving subsidies to one group or to another group, every other group in the country will come to Washington clamoring for subsidies and saying, "We cannot continue to produce and to meet the war requirements without receiving a subsidy."

As the Senator from Colorado [Mr. JOHNSON] has pointed out, the Government purchases or takes all the copper which is produced in this country. The Government could have accomplished the same purpose without giving subsidies simply by saying, "We will give you 16 cents or 17 cents for the copper you produce over what you produced last year."

Subsidies are wrong in principle, whether paid to copper companies, or to packers, or to manufacturers, or to any other group in the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Especially is it wrong to take the subsidy money out of the funds of the R. F. C., which is a banking institution and which was not created by Congress for the purpose of making appropriations which are nonrecoverable. The R. F. C. is a banking institution supposed to make loans which will later be repaid, or at least such part of them as it is possible to recover. In this instance the R. F. C. is being used as a means to bypass Congress, so Congress will not have anything to say about the matter at all. Thus the funds which Congress authorized for banking purposes are being given away and will never be recovered.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, we see day by day attempts being made by various bureaus and departments to bypass Congress in every possible way, shape, and form. Yet those who cry the loudest about preserving democracy and parliamentary government in this country constantly shout that it is necessary for these bureaus and departments to bypass Congress because they cannot get everything they want from Congress through the ordinary methods which are established and under the ordinary principles of a democratic republic.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. It is also true, is it not, that anyone who accepts

subsidies from the Federal Treasury accepts at the same time regulation by the different bureaus?

Mr. WHEELER. That is correct. I repeat what I said at the beginning, that I think subsidies are wrong in principle. I wish to compliment the publisher of the newspaper in which the editorial previously mentioned was published and the Secretary of the Navy for permitting the publication of the editorial, if he did permit it, and I wish to say that I sincerely hope I shall be afforded an opportunity to vote on legislation which will forbid the R. F. C., or any other agency of Government, from granting subsidies unless the subsidies are first approved by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggam
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdoch	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. What is the amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

And to insert:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, in-

cluding (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C., 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under the caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming, except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under

the various transfer agreements with the several State rural rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorizations herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

FARM TENANCY

To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), as follows:

Salaries and expenses: For necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said Act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said Act \$1,326,070.

Loans: For loans to individual farmers in accordance with title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$30,000,000, which sum shall be borrowed from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation at an interest rate of 3 per centum per annum: *Provided*, That the amount which is available to any State or Territory for making loans under such title I shall be distributed by the Secretary, in accordance with rules prescribed by him, among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory, except that he shall not distribute to any such county or parish in excess of three times the amount which would be distributed to such county or parish were the entire amount available to the State or Territory distributed among the several counties or parishes in such State or Territory on the basis of farm population and the prevalence of tenancy; and the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and directed to lend such sum to the Secretary upon the security of any obligations of borrowers from the Secretary under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006): *Provided*, That the amount loaned by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation shall not exceed 85 per centum of the principal amount outstanding of the obligations constituting the security therefor: *Provided further*, That the Secretary may utilize proceeds from payments of principal and interest on any loans made under such title I to repay the Reconstruction Finance Corporation the amount borrowed therefrom under the authority of this paragraph: *Provided further*, That the amount of notes, bonds, debentures, and other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under existing law is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions hereof.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, under rule XVI, I make the point of order against the committee amendment now under consideration, beginning in line 4 on page 89.

Paragraph 2 of rule XVI provides that:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legis-

lation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

Paragraph 4 of the same rule provides that:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, the provisions included under the caption "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," were not in the bill as it came over from the House of Representatives, and there has never been any authority in law for this appropriation. This program was started by Executive order in the Federal Emergency Relief Administration in 1934. On April 30, 1935, the President issued an Executive order creating the Resettlement Administration, which took over that part of the F. E. R. A. program, as well as certain activities of other agencies. On September 1, 1937, the Secretary of Agriculture issued a memorandum creating the Farm Security Administration as successor to the Resettlement Administration, which had been transferred to the Department of Agriculture by Executive order of the President on December 31, 1936.

The Congress has never enacted legislation creating the Farm Security Administration, and has never authorized by law the program known as Loans, Grants, and Rural Rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I ask the attention of the Senate to the language on page 90, beginning in line 5 "without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended."

That is certainly legislation, because it sets aside existing law.

In line 9 we find the language:

Provided, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

The rules have repeatedly been interpreted to mean that any additional duty or responsibility placed upon any agency of the Government, especially when such agency was not authorized by law, is regarded as legislation.

The language of the amendment beginning on line 18 on page 90, and continuing to and including line 5 on page 91, can certainly be regarded as legislation.

I also invite attention to the language beginning in line 6 on page 91, as follows:

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural-rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. That is a change in existing law.

Mr. BYRD. Yes, that is a change in the existing law, and is in the same cat-

egory as the legislative amendment offered by the Senator from Georgia with respect to the loans of \$30,000,000 to be made by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the Rural Electrification Act.

Mr. President, it seems very obvious to me that, with the exception of perhaps that part of the amendment on page 92 beginning with line 5 and ending in line 13, which represents restriction, the remainder of the amendment offered by the committee down to and certainly including the first paragraph on page 93 is general legislation upon a general appropriation bill.

In accordance with the rules of the Senate, Mr. President, I make a point of order against the amendment.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I believe that clearly under the precedents of the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia in this instance is not well taken and should be overruled. The Senator has stated there is no statutory authority for these rehabilitation loans. I respectfully invite his attention to title II of an act of Congress approved July 22, 1937. It reads as follows:

TITLE II—REHABILITATION LOANS

BORROWERS AND TERMS

SEC. 21 (a). Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the refinancing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

That is the statutory authority delegated by an act of Congress, which has never been repealed, to the Secretary to make loans for rural rehabilitation.

I ask Senators to refer to line 19 on page 89 beginning with the words "farm debt adjustment service." There is statutory authority found in this act for the carrying out of that service, and I read from section 22 of the same act from which I have already read, which was approved, as I have said, on July 22, 1937:

The Secretary shall have power to assist in the voluntary adjustment of indebtedness between farm debtors and their creditors and may cooperate with and pay the whole or part of the expenses of State, Territorial, and local agencies and committees engaged in such debt adjustment. He is also authorized to continue and carry out undertakings with respect to farm-debt adjustment uncompleted at the time when appropriations for the purpose of this section are first available. Services furnished by the Secretary under this section shall be without charge to the debtor or creditor.

I further invite the attention of the Senate to title I of the same act which provides as follows:

The Secretary of Agriculture (hereinafter referred to as the "Secretary") is authorized to make loans in the United States and in the Territories of Alaska and Hawaii and in Puerto Rico to persons eligible to receive the benefits of this title to enable such persons to acquire farms.

(b) Only farm tenants, farm laborers, sharecroppers, and other individuals who obtain, or who recently obtained, the major portion of their income from farming operations shall be eligible to receive the benefits of this title.

Then follow a great many details with regard to the making of loans to farm tenants, to farm laborers, and to sharecroppers to enable them to purchase farms.

So, Mr. President, so far as concerns the charge which has been made that the Congress has never approved rural rehabilitation loans, I thought it was well for me to read these items in the act—this still live statute—to show that Congress has had ample authority in times past for a comprehensive program of rural rehabilitation. The appropriations which have been made from year to year for the purpose of making these loans have been made to the Secretary of Agriculture and not to the Farm Security Administration. The Farm Security Administration is the agency which has been utilized by the Secretary. But so far as the bill before us is concerned, the appropriation would be made to the Secretary of Agriculture just as has been the case in times past.

There are some portions of this amendment, Mr. President, which are legislative in character. The reference made by the Senator from Virginia to the provision authorizing borrowings from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation does not appear in the basic act to which I have referred. However, Mr. President, I do not depend, in opposing the point of order, solely upon statutory authority for the detailed program set forth for the making of rural-rehabilitation loans. This amendment was reported by the committee in the bill on the strength of one of the most elementary rules of both legislative bodies. It has always been recognized that where one body legislates upon a subject the other body has a right to amend it in any way it sees fit so long as the amendment is germane to the question which is referred to in the bill which comes before it. Every provision of the amendment is germane to a program of rural rehabilitation.

Mr. President, I submit that the House, by inserting by a floor amendment the language found on page 89 of the pending bill appropriating \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I, and by inserting the words—I will read from line 9—"and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act," legislated thereon. It makes no difference how slender the thread of legislation may be which comes to us from the other House. If there is any legislation there at all we are entitled to transform it into a steel cable, or a steel beam, so long as the amendment which we offer is germane to the general subject.

The provision in the House bill is undoubtedly legislation. I wish to submit to the Senate the language of section 6 of the act approved July 22, 1937. A comparison of this language with the House provision clearly demonstrates the fact that the latter is legislation:

Sec. 6. To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year

ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

I hope Senators, without regard to their views on the merits of this issue, will listen to the language which I shall now read:

Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out this title during such fiscal year.

I hope Senators will mark that language well—not more than 5 percent of the amount appropriated in any fiscal year for carrying out this section for the purpose of making loans, shall be available for administrative expenses.

Mr. President, when the House struck out on the floor all the loan money and appropriated \$500,000 for the collection of outstanding loans, without making any authorization for loans, it made an appropriation of 100 percent of the sums which were available for loans, and there is no way of escaping the fact that that is legislation. It may be minor, but it has the effect of repealing section 6 of the basic act which was approved in 1937. So long as the House of Representatives legislates in any respect the Senate has a right to go fully into the whole question of rural rehabilitation and tenant purchase loans.

The point-made, Mr. President, at the outside, can only present the question as to whether or not the amendment is germane under paragraph 4 of rule XVI. I contend if the House of Representatives undertakes to repeal an act in a general appropriation bill, that the Senate may strike out the language repealing the act and provide for amending the act in the general appropriation bill. To rule otherwise would be absolutely to reverse every precedent the Senate has ever established in dealing with this question. It is undoubtedly in order for this committee amendment to come before the Senate and to be considered on its merits unless it is desired to repeal every precedent the Senate has established concerning the powers of one House to deal with an amendment of the other House which has the effect of changing existing law.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the Senate amendment had been adopted by the House, all except the provision for \$97,500,000 to be loaned by the R. F. C., and the Senate committee had then attempted to insert that amendment in the House amendment, would not that be new and general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. No, I do not think so. If there was any piece of legislation in the House provision we have a right to amend it in any words which are germane to the subject.

Mr. TAFT. Suppose the House feels that because of the authority of existing law these appropriations are justified, and the Senate comes along and passes an entirely new provision that is not authorized in existing law but brings a new element into the picture and ap-

propriates \$97,500,000, would not that be an amendment proposing new legislation? Why is it not the same thing if it is included in the amendment which the Senate committee proposes to the House amendment?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry the Senator from Ohio missed the point I was undertaking to make. I am making the point that the House did legislate on this question. If we go on the supposition that the House did not legislate on the subject, but that it merely conformed to the Rehabilitation Act of 1937, the amendment would have been subject to a point of order, but the House did not content itself with dealing with any provision of existing law; it undertook by this language to repeal and to nullify section 6 of the act to which I have referred, which provided that for administrative expenses the appropriations should never exceed 5 percent of the amount which was made available for loans.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, paragraph 4 of rule XVI provides:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Why is not the provision about the R. F. C. general legislation and why is not the amendment itself subject to the rule?

Mr. RUSSELL. Because, Mr. President, the first clause of subdivision 4 of rule XVI relates to amendments which propose legislation de novo. It does not relate to amendments undertaking to amend legislative provisions which come to the Senate from the House of Representatives. The second clause of the paragraph provides—

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received.

That is the only language in the entire rule which might be applied to the amendment now under consideration.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that is very much more damning to the proposal, because the amendment is purely general legislation not proposed by the House. I cannot understand the basis or the contention of the Senator from Georgia that it is not general legislation. There is no statutory authority for us to tell the R. F. C. to get into the picture and loan \$97,500,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. I concede that, but the Senator still misses the point. The first clause of the rule is only to be applied in the event there is no legislation in the bill before the Senate. If there is legislation in the bill before the Senate, the Senate has a right to proceed to change the legislative provision which comes before it from the other House, provided the changes proposed are germane.

Mr. TAFT. I think it is perfectly clear that in this bill there cannot be inserted in the committee amendment a new provision of law, even one relating to such a matter as including employees under the civil service, which is not in the House amendment and not authorized by any existing law and which no one ever

heard of until the Senate committee inserted it as an amendment. I cannot understand the argument of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think that the Senator from Ohio wishes very strongly to understand it. The fact is, nevertheless, that, without regard to the views of the Senator from Ohio, the established precedent of the Senate is that where the House itself has violated the rule against legislation on an appropriation bill the Senate has the right to legislate on the same subject in the Senate. The only rule that pertains to it is as to whether or not the Senate proposal is germane to the House amendment.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator is quoting precedents. Does he know of any single precedent in the whole history of the Senate where it has ever been held that because the House chooses to legislate on an appropriation bill with regard to one particular item the Senate, therefore, under its own rules, or the Appropriations Committee, has authority to legislate in any other way it might desire? In other words, assuming the Senator's own argument that the House has legislated with regard to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, the Senator's argument would lead anybody to believe that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee, under the rules of the Senate, has authority and power to legislate on anything with the subject of farm tenancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I never made any such contention.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. But it is a logical result of the Senator's argument.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is what the Senator from Missouri contends. The Senate committee has not undertaken to deal with any new question. The only questions we are dealing with are the ones that have always been contained in this bill, under the act referred to in the House bill, and which the House undertook to repeal when it inserted this provision in the bill. All of them have been carried on under the general act providing for rural rehabilitation loans, for tenant purchases, as well as for rural rehabilitation where purchase loans were not involved. There can be no question that this amendment is germane to the act in question. The rural rehabilitation loans are in the same bill that carries the tenant purchase loans which are referred to in the House provision which is before the Senate. If the House undertakes to legislate and does legislate in any degree upon any question, certainly the Senate has a right to legislate upon the same question. That is absolutely fundamental, and no other ruling has ever been made, Mr. President, in the period I have been in this body; and, I am not familiar with any precedent to the contrary.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator was reading from an act which was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes.

Mr. BYRD. To create the Farmers' Home Corporation. I am reliably in-

formed that that corporation has never been created and is in a state of innocuous desuetude. Is the Senator assenting that because of this law, which has never become operative, this particular corporation has never been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; the question of the Senator from Virginia demonstrates unfamiliarity with this entire question.

Mr. BYRD. I would thank the Senator very much for an answer.

Mr. RUSSELL. I wish to point out that there is no mandatory provision here for the establishment of that corporation.

Mr. BYRD. I asked the Senator a question, and I am entitled to an answer from the Senator.

Mr. RUSSELL. I regret if I seemed to be abrupt with the Senator.

Mr. BYRD. I think the Senator was quite abrupt.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. I asked a very courteous question of the Senator. The Senator always tries to make these debates personal, which I do not think is proper. I have my right to my convictions, just as the Senator from Georgia has a right to his.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have absolutely no desire to infringe on any conviction the Senator may have.

Mr. BYRD. I certainly have a right to ask a question, which the Senator should not object to. The Senator was quoting from an act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, which, he contended, gave legislative authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, and supplies, and I ask this question, Has the Farmers' Home Corporation ever been organized?

Mr. RUSSELL. Not that I know of.

Mr. BYRD. It is a dormant corporation; is it not?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is dormant, because the Secretary, under the specific terms of the law, was given two methods of procedure. One of them was that he could proceed under title I or title II to lend funds through any agency of his own choice, or he could proceed through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. BYRD. He is not proceeding through the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I know that, and there is nothing in the act to require him to do it. It is absolutely optional. He may create the Farmers' Home Corporation. He never saw fit to do it, but that does not curtail his power to make loans under title I and title II.

Mr. BYRD. But this is what it says:

Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power—

And so forth. Section 23 applies to the Farmers' Home Corporation, which has never been organized. The act was passed, and was approved July 22, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will read section 23 he will see that it does not apply to the Farmers' Home Corporation. It says:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary—

Not to the Farmers' Home Corporation, but—

available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530—

And so forth. It has no reference to the Farmers' Home Corporation, and there is nothing in the act to make it mandatory on the Secretary to establish that corporation. It was an alternative. For some reason the Secretary saw fit to exercise the powers contained in titles I and II of the act, and he never saw fit to create the Farmers' Home Corporation.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALLGREN in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. As I understand the contention of the able Senator from Georgia, it is that the amendment reported by the Committee on Appropriations stems from the provision written by the House of Representatives, which appears on page 89, entitled "Farm Tenancy."

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator states my position correctly.

Mr. LUCAS. Will the able Senator tell me what part of the amendment applies strictly to the farm-tenancy program, provided for in what is known as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. It is my contention that when the House of Representatives proceeds to legislate with respect to one title of this act, the Senate has a right to legislate with respect to all titles of the Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I do not say that I disagree with the able Senator on that, but I was wondering whether it could be segregated and broken down to the point where we would know definitely which portion of the amendment specifically applied to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act; or is the entire amendment a part of the Bankhead-Jones Act?

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senate provisions are offered to make appropriations for the Secretary with respect to general powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Mr. LUCAS. I appreciate that, and I understand it thoroughly, but I think there is confusion.

Mr. RUSSELL. We go further than the Bankhead-Jones Act, I concede freely, but if the House has the right to deviate from the Bankhead-Jones Act in one respect, to legislate on the question of rehabilitation and tenant loans, we have a right to deviate so long as our deviation is germane.

Mr. LUCAS. In other words, the Senator's contention is that once the House opens up the field, there is no limit as to how far the Senate may go, so long as it is dealing with loans for rehabilitation in connection with farms.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator is exactly correct and the position is sound.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Am I to understand that if the House had legislated on the Bankhead-Jones Act without violating it in any way or attempting to impose any

additional legislative provisions, then the Senate, under the Senator's amendment, would be barred also from general legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that is correct.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator claims that because the House, dealing with the Bankhead-Jones Act, proposes one kind of general legislation—I do not admit it, except for the purpose of this question—therefore the Senate may impose an entirely different kind of general legislation, in spite of the Senate rule that no general legislation may be proposed to an appropriation bill?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; so long as it is germane, and I contend that paragraph 4 of rule XVI relates only to new legislation and not to changing legislation which comes before us from the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. But it seems to me clear that the amendment dealing with the R. F. C. is new legislation. It may have reference to a provision that is related to the Bankhead-Jones Act, but it is new legislation, and I cannot see how it can be said it does not come under the rule.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have undertaken to give my own position on that question. It is my construction that paragraph 4, which the Senator is discussing, relates only to new legislation which might be offered in the bill, but when the House has deviated from the rule which provides there shall be no legislation on an appropriation bill, undoubtedly, under all the precedents, if the House legislates in any respect, then the only qualification on the Senate provisions is that they must be germane to the general subject involved in the legislation, and this amendment is undoubtedly germane to the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is referred to in the House legislative provision which appears on page 89 of the bill.

Mr. TAFT. I should like to ask the Senator one other question. I cannot see why the Senate provision is not one dealing in general legislation. There is merely a failure on the part of the House to appropriate for some of the purposes of the act; but that is not a violation of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. The language in the House provision which undertakes to liquidate the question by adding the words "and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made" shows that it is legislation, because section 6 of the basic act, which I have once read, says that no money shall be allowed for administrative expenses in excess of 5 percent of the amount that is allowed for loans. The House did not allow a dollar for loans, therefore, if they had appropriated \$5 for administration it would have had the effect of annulling section 6 of the basic act, which provides that the administrative expenses shall not exceed 5 percent of the amount made available for loans.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me that can hardly be said to be a violation. Possibly the \$500,000 appropriation is void.

Mr. RUSSELL. It is not void; it is legislation, because it is made in derogation of the express terms of the statute,

and contrary to the express terms of the statute. There can be no question about it being legislation. It might as well be provided in the appropriation bill that the Bankhead-Jones Act is repealed. Then would the Senator contend that we could not strike out that provision and offer an amendment which amended the Bankhead-Jones Act?

It is clear to me that, under the rule, the only question possible in this matter is whether the amendment is germane. Suppose the House tries to repeal some act in an appropriation bill and their action comes to the Senate. The Senate is not compelled to accept this House provision. The Senate has some rights. If the House went to the extent of saying in a general appropriation bill that an act approved on such and such a date "is hereby repealed," undoubtedly and unquestionably, in view of every precedent, the Senate could go into that matter, and amend the act which the House sought to repeal or reject the House amendment. Any other ruling would deny the Senate coordinate powers with the House.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I wish to make a brief statement, because I think this is a very important question. I wish that Senators could disassociate the issue involved in the amendment and consider the matter from the standpoint of the parliamentary situation. I know it is always difficult to do that, but there was very sound ground, Mr. President, for the provision in the rule that an appropriation bill should not carry general legislation. It gave too great opportunity for abuse of the great power of lumping together legislation with appropriations, and making it impossible either to vote against or for the measure without involving the question of appropriations. So I want it generally understood that I am in deep sympathy with that provision of the rule.

But, as I see it, that is not the issue now at stake. The issue at stake is the question of whether or not the Senate shall maintain its unbroken precedents holding that it has the right to explore any field of general legislation which the House of Representatives may have entered. That, Mr. President, is a vital question; it is a question of great extreme importance as affecting the power of the Senate.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Wisconsin yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. Of course, it is not a question of the power of the Senate. It is the Senate's own rule which is being violated. It is a question of what the Senate wants. The Senate can set aside the rule if it wants to do so. The Senate can change the rule. It is not a question between the Senate and the House of Representatives; it is merely a question whether we shall abide by our own rules.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. If the Senator will bear with me, perhaps I cannot convince him, but, at least, I will have an opportunity to state why I think it is of great importance. If, for example, the Senate should take the position that the

House of Representatives, having legislated upon a subject, the Senate could not pursue that field and alter, amend, enlarge, change, or shrink the action of the House, it would bind itself to a legislative provision in an appropriation bill, which must pass in order that a particular department or agency may continue to function. The Senate would be helpless; it could not change, it could not alter the action taken by the House of Representatives.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senate can strike out the legislative provision which the House has inserted.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes.

Mr. TAFT. That is entirely within its power.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Yes; it is within its power, Mr. President; but if the conferees on the part of the House maintain their position, the Senate is ultimately confronted with either yielding to the ipse dixit and the legislative action of the House without amendment, change, or alteration, or killing the appropriation bill. That is the whole theory behind this general rule. The purpose of the rule is to preserve the power of the Senate to act in any way the majority of the Senate sees fit, whenever the other body may have entered the field of legislation. It could not have been better put than it was put by Vice President Marshall when he said:

Notwithstanding the rule of the Senate to the effect that general legislation may not be attached to an appropriation bill, still when the House of Representatives opens the door and proceeds to enter upon a field of general legislation, the House having opened the door, the Senate of the United States can walk in through the door and pursue the field.

Mr. President, I contend that it is absolutely necessary that we maintain that precedent. It is clearly a question here of the House having entered the field. The question which is raised in paragraph 4 of rule XVI is certainly one which could be given consideration, namely, whether the legislative action of the Senate committee is germane to the legislative action taken by the House of Representatives. I agree in that respect 100 percent with everything that has been said by the able Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], and I think he has proven beyond peradventure of argument that the action of the Senate committee is germane.

But the question at issue is not as yet one of germaneness. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] has raised the point of order that the amendment proposes general legislation, and I appeal to the Senate, and I appeal to the Chair, not to sustain such a point of order, not to reverse the unbroken precedents of the Senate, but to maintain the legislative power of the Senate on a parity with the House of Representatives.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Chair understand that the Senator from Wisconsin has raised the question of relevancy?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. No; I did not raise it. I said that it could be raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I desire to follow the invitation extended by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] in one of his more courteous moments, and discuss this matter as a matter of parliamentary procedure rather than on the merits of the substantive proposition involved.

It seems to me, Mr. President, that we have listened to a very remarkable demonstration this afternoon. I have often heard it cited as the height of extreme statement that a man could take a match stem and run it into a lumber yard. But the Senator from Georgia has gone even beyond that in tenuous theory. The Senator from Georgia proposes to take a match stem and run it into a vast forest, into great sulphur mines, great factories, great railroad transportation systems, a lease-lend act, into great steamship facilities to transport the products of the match stem overseas.

Mr. President, the argument advanced by the Senator from Georgia and the Senator from Wisconsin, reduced to its simplest terms, simply means that if the House of Representatives in a general appropriation bill violates its own rule by the inclusion of any item of legislation, by that act it automatically suspends the rule of the Senate as to the inclusion of legislation in general appropriation bills, not only as to the item with which the House has dealt, but as to any other item which in its wisdom the Senate Committee on Appropriations may desire to tack onto it.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to correct the Senator's statement that I made any such contention. I said that the amendment had to be germane.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am stating the effects of the argument made by the Senator from Georgia, as I understood it. I was not proposing to quote the Senator from Georgia verbatim. But the argument of the Senator from Georgia is that by reason of the fact that the House of Representatives in a provision beginning in line 5 and extending through line 14 on page 89, according to the contention of the Senator from Georgia, has changed the proportion set up by the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, a specific act approved July 22, 1937, as to the proportion of administrative expenses, therefore the Committee on Appropriations is authorized under the Senate's own rules—and that is the only contention here as to the rules of the Senate; the contention is not made with respect to the right of the Senate as a whole to act, but as to the procedure under the rules of the Senate, that, therefore, the Appropriations Committee is authorized under the rules of the Senate to report an amendment dealing with any other legislation connected with agriculture or farm tenancy which the committee may see fit to report. That, as I see it, is the only issue before the Senate.

Mr. President, this is a specific act in connection with which the House is accused of having legislated. I do not desire to waste the time of the Senate in arguing whether the provision which

is stricken out in the House bill, to which I referred, is or is not legislation, because that is not necessary for the purpose of my argument. For the purpose of the argument I am perfectly willing to concede the proposition of the Senator from Georgia that the House has legislated by changing the requirement of the original act of July 22, 1937.

But, Mr. President, in the interest of orderly legislation, in the interest of preserving the rules of the Senate, in the interest of preventing appropriation committees constantly proposing substantive legislation on general appropriation bills, I deny the proposition that if the House has legislated with regard to the provisions of a specific bill, namely, the so-called Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937, the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has a right to go afield and take in any other subject which in its wisdom it deems desirable to take in in order to affect the question of farm tenancy or of agriculture in general. That is the question before the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LUCAS. Do I correctly understand that the contention of the distinguished senior Senator from Missouri is simply that, insofar as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act is concerned, the Committee on Appropriations had the power and authority to explore any field in connection with that one piece of legislation?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Yes, Mr. President; the Senator is correct.

Mr. LUCAS. And that when the committee goes beyond that, regardless of whether the legislation it recommends affects the farmers, the legislation which the committee then proposes is subject to the point of order?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, the Senator has admirably stated the position. In other words, a while ago the Senator from Wisconsin quoted a decision of a distinguished former Vice President in which he said, "the gate was left open and the Senate had a right to go through it." However, the Senate has no right, under its own rules, to do so. I desire to draw a proper distinction relative to the question of the right as between the two bodies. The Senate has a right to do anything it wants to do; but the Senate, under its own rules, as a matter of procedure cannot go through the gate the House has opened, and knock down both sides, and pour through as a general horde.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Does not the Senator's whole argument turn on the question of germaneness?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. It does not.

Mr. VANDENBERG. It would seem to me that it does.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The point of germaneness would apply, let me say, to the Senator from Michigan, to the question of whether a particular amendment would be germane to the provisions of

the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act. No Senator has contended—at least, I have not heard any Senator do so—that there is anything in the amendment which is germane to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I contend that it is germane to it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, with all due respect to my friend, the Senator from Georgia, I must say that I suspect that, in claiming germaneness, the proponents of the committee amendment are endeavoring to escape from the provisions of the rule, and to submit the matter to a majority vote of the Senate on the question of germaneness, because the rule specifically provides for a majority vote on the question of germaneness. It seems to me there can be no question as to germaneness to the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act when the committee takes up an entirely different act—in fact two different acts; they were cited by the Senator from Georgia himself—and goes beyond that, and changes that act or those acts by legislation, sets up new machinery under the R. F. C., and goes entirely outside the field of any administration of the Bankhead-Jones Act, which is the legislation claimed by the Senator from Georgia as his original authority for new legislation in the bill. I say there is no justification for going clear outside that act and setting up entirely new authorities—different acts—and setting up entirely new duties and different questions of personnel classification.

Mr. President, as I say, I intend to discuss at this time only the parliamentary situation, because I think a very important parliamentary question is involved. I think the whole practice of the Congress of restricting legislation on appropriation bills is involved in this question. If the practice—a practice more exemplified by this bill than by any other I have ever seen—of having the Appropriations Committee of the Senate absolutely substitute its judgment for that of the legislative committees involved is indulged in and carried out, then I think the other committees of the Senate and of the House might as well be abolished, because there is no use in having any other legislating done if the Committee on Appropriations, in a "must" bill, a bill which is very necessary to be signed, a general supply bill, is to come along and do the legislating.

Mr. President, of course, the reason for the rule which has always existed in the Senate and always existed in the House, at least for many years—certainly for all my lifetime—is very readily evident. Legislation comes before either body of the Congress for consideration upon its merits. It is open to serious discussion, at least in this body, and formerly was in the House; it is open to amendment; and it is open to any legislative action which the body concerned may see fit to take. It may be passed by one body, may fail of passage in the other body, or may pass both bodies and be vetoed by the President, without the sense of compulsion which applies in connection with general appropriation bills.

As to the great supply bills necessary to be passed in order to have the Government continue to operate, they have always been given a high state of precedence, as we say in the Senate, or privilege, as is said in the House; they have been protected against dilatory amendments and various other kinds of amendments, in order to expedite their passage. They are recognized as "must" bills in both the Senate and the House of Representatives; and only under the most extraordinary circumstances has a President of the United States vetoed a general supply bill.

Mr. President, it is for that reason, for that very justifiable reason, that both Houses have from time immemorial adopted rules against having their own Appropriations Committees, in the first instance, or individual Senators or Representatives, in the second instance, offer propositions for legislation on general appropriation bills.

As I said a while ago, this bill is the most remarkable bill I ever saw. I think there are 116 amendments to it. Approximately 100 of them have been subject to points of order. I am not certain as to the exact number; the Senator from Georgia can correct me if I am in error.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I may say that the Senator has slightly exaggerated.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly a great many of them have been subject to points of order; have they not?

Mr. RUSSELL. I think that 5 or 6 out of the 116 have been. The Senator is slightly mistaken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. A great many of them have been subject to a point of order, and the Senator has recognized that fact by serving notice, under the rules of the Senate—as he has a perfect right to do—to suspend the rule.

However, Mr. President, as to this amendment, involving—as it does—open, flagrant legislation in every line of it—at least, until we reach the second paragraph on page 93, which is the fourth page of the amendment involving legislation—attempt has been made to railroad it through, on the theory that because the House has dealt with one bill, the Senate Appropriations Committee is relieved of its obligation under the rule, and can, as it sees fit, deal with any other measure in any way connected with the whole subject of agriculture.

Mr. President, I do not believe that a more important parliamentary question has been presented to the Senate during my membership in the Senate. I believe that if the Senate should adopt the view of the distinguished Senator from Georgia it might very well proceed to abolish all the standing committees of the Senate except the Committee on Appropriations, because the Committee on Appropriations would then be made the sole judge of what should be in an appropriation bill and what should not be in it. When that is done, the authority of the standing committees of the Senate is completely annihilated.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, the rule in this case is perfectly clear:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation.

In another place:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

It is admitted that this is general legislation. It is said that because of some precedents or rulings there should be incorporated into these provisions an exception which is not there. It is not in the rule. Not a word is said about it in the rule. The exception is said to be "unless the House, in dealing with the matter, has proposed some general legislation." There may be rulings to the effect that there should be such an exception in the rule, but it is not there. I do not see why we should not abide by the rules of the Senate as they are written. I cannot understand how we can write an exception into a perfectly clear rule of the Senate.

There is no doubt that this is general legislation; but it is claimed that the House has violated the law. I do not even admit that. I do not see how the House has violated the law. The House simply authorized \$500,000 for necessary expenses in carrying on this law, because there are some things to carry along. It appropriated no money for the general purposes of the Bankhead-Jones Act. Therefore, it is said that it violated the section of the law which says that—

To carry out the provisions of sections 1001 to 1006 of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter. Not more than 5 percent of the sums appropriated for any fiscal year in pursuance of this section shall be available for administrative expenses in carrying out sections 1001 to 1006 of this title during such fiscal year.

That is section 6, title I, of the Bankhead-Jones Act.

Frankly, I do not believe that the House violated the law. If the House did not choose to appropriate anything for loans under this act for this year, I see nothing in this provision that is intended to prevent the appropriation of the necessary funds for administrative expenses. In other words, the amendment did not purport to deal with any such situation. In order to prevent extravagance, the act provided that the general cost of administering loans should not exceed 5 percent of the figure authorized for any particular year. It was not the intention, if Congress should choose not to appropriate anything, to say that it should appropriate nothing for administrative expenses. Certainly, to hang on to that supposed violation of the House rule the power to suspend the entire Senate rule and step out into general legislation to authorize the R. F. C., under no legislative authority whatever, to advance \$97,500,000, or

twice as much as is authorized under the Bankhead-Jones law, is hanging a tremendous argument on a very small point.

I do not believe that the House violated the law. I do not think that that section of the Bankhead-Jones law would prohibit Congress, if it chose to stop loans, from appropriating a sum to administer the loans which have already been made.

So, Mr. President, it seems perfectly clear to me that under the express terms of the rule this is general legislation; it is admitted to be general legislation, and it should be ruled out of consideration by the Senate.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, I desire to say a few words in support of the position taken by the distinguished Senator from Georgia. It seems to me that sometimes a little common sense can solve most of these technical arguments.

I quite agree with what the Senator from Wisconsin has said. The question here is whether or not the Senate will undertake to prevent itself from dealing with matters of legislation which have come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. However we may wish to obscure that question with technical argument, that is the fundamental question which remains. The only question here is whether or not, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, the Committee on Appropriations is bringing in new or general legislation. The common-sense view is to determine what was meant by the phrase "new or general legislation." It is my understanding that the precedents of this body, without exception, support the contention that the rule was designed to prevent the Appropriations Committee of the Senate from initiating new or general legislation. It was not intended, and has never been enforced, to prevent the Senate Committee on Appropriations from dealing with legislative matters which come to it from the House in an appropriation bill. That is the explanation of the decision so clearly laid down by Vice President Marshall, which was quoted by the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Would not the Senate be in a very unique position if it were to follow the suggestion of the Senator from Ohio and discard all the precedents and rulings which have been made by the presiding officers interpreting the rules of the Senate, and start now to interpret them de novo, and in the strictest sense of the word, as he argues the rule must be interpreted? It seems to me that we must take into consideration the precedents and interpretations of the rule if we are not to discard a large body of procedure by which the Senate has been governed for many years.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I quite agree with the Senator from Wisconsin.

The common-sense view of the situation is perfectly clear. The House of Representatives has dealt with this subject matter, which has been in the ap-

propriation act for 5 or 6 years, and which therefore cannot be regarded as new legislation. The proposed appropriation is supported by Budget estimates which have come to the House and to the Senate.

These provisions are now stricken out to a certain degree by the House in a legislative amendment. The House, acting within its rights, wrote this legislative amendment into the bill, in effect repealing a legislative enactment which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years. The Bankhead-Jones Act not only deals with tenant purchases, but also with loans and rehabilitation. So the House, having acted and sent the bill to the Senate, we must acknowledge that the House was acting within the scope of its rights.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator does not claim that the House could not refuse to appropriate any money simply because an act was in force; does he?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Certainly not. The House could have refused to appropriate, but it did not do so. The House dealt with a law which has been on the statute books for 5 or 6 years, and which dealt with a subject which has been handled in appropriation bills for 5 or 6 years, and undertook to modify the whole system.

As we all know, the purpose was to destroy the Farm Security Administration. I am ready to acknowledge that there are and have been features about the Farm Security Administration which have not had my support. The Appropriations Committee has attempted to deal with that question, and has provided for the termination of those activities; but the legislative judgment of the Senate and the House has been that the Bankhead-Jones Act ought to be maintained, and that loans for rehabilitation purposes should be made to small farmers. The House, acting within the scope of its legislative power, sent to the Senate this legislative amendment to the bill.

Those who desire to destroy the Farm Security Administration are urging the technicality of the Senate rule against new or general legislation upon an appropriation bill. I submit to the Senate that that rule was directed against the initiation of new legislation in the Senate committee. It was not intended and never has been interpreted as preventing the Senate from dealing with legislative matters which have been sent to this body by the House of Representatives in an appropriation bill.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I have been necessarily absent from the Chamber for a time and have not heard all the debate. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Wyoming. Does the Senator from Wyoming take the position that the House of Representatives may repeal a law by refusing to appropriate money for performing the functions provided for in the law and that, as a result, the Senate does not have any right to disagree with the House?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. In effect, that is the position that is taken.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. That is certainly not the position.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said it was, in effect.

Mr. TAFT. The House may pass a bill, and we may vote into it an appropriation of \$50,000,000 without the slightest question. There is no question about our right to disagree with the desire of the House to end the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit me, I was merely trying to answer the question of the Senator from Minnesota and stating my opinion. As I understood his question, he has correctly stated the situation.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator's understanding is very incorrect.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I was incorrect in that. There were two questions. The second question concerns relevancy, whether or not the changes which have been made by the Senate Committee on Appropriations in the legislative amendment which came from the House are relevant. That is a question which must be passed upon by the Senate. But I do contend that the rule does not prohibit the amendment being submitted.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I have no desire to interrupt the Senator from Wyoming in a statement of his position. My reason for asking him to yield was that in answering the question of the Senator from Minnesota, the Senator from Wyoming apparently undertook to state the position of those of us who believe the point of order is well taken, and he stated it 1,000-percent erroneously, and I desire to challenge the statement of the Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I said, in response to the Senator from Minnesota that, in effect, what he stated was correct.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. I yield.

Mr. GEORGE. On the question of relevancy I should like to ask the Senator from Wyoming—relevant to what? What is the test of relevancy?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. The test is the subject matter—

Mr. GEORGE. Of what the House inserted?

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Of the whole legislative enactment of what the House put in and what it struck out.

Mr. GEORGE. It did not strike out anything, Mr. President. In plain language, it put in a provision which is said to be contrary to an existing provision of the original law. How are we to test the rule of relevancy? What has that to do with the civil service? What has that to do with the R. F. C.? What has that to do with enlarging the powers of the R. F. C.? I am worried about what is the standard of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Allow me to say to the Senator from Georgia that, as I see it, the standard of relevancy is the act under which and for which this appropriation has been and is here being made. It has been made for 4 or 5 years, and there have been provisions in other appropriation bills authorizing the R. F. C. to advance money to be used for loans and rehabilitation under the Bankhead-Jones Act. My contention is—and I think it is the contention of the Senator from Georgia, the chairman of the subcommittee, but I would rather have him speak for himself—that the amendment reported by his committee is altogether relevant to that general subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I desire to add only one word further. The Senator from Missouri has stated this is something entirely new and we are trying to railroad it through the Senate. I merely wish to say that this program has been in effect for a number of years. The provisions relating to the borrowing of funds from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation have been enacted into law year after year for at least the last 4 years. I have not checked the dates; I think it has been for 5 years, but I know it has been for at least 4 years.

Mr. President, this provision was one of those which came to the floor of the House of Representatives without the benefit of a rule which is usually accorded the Appropriations Committee by the Committee on Rules. Due to the fact that the provision was legislation in the House, the entire matter went out on a point of order on the floor of the House. The chairman of the subcommittee who had charge of the bill in the House then offered the amendment which I contend amply supports any provision which the Senate sees fit to place in this bill which is relevant to the whole question of rehabilitation of farm tenancy in this country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Georgia yield for a question by the Chair?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; I say the entire amendment is relevant.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will state it.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator from Virginia has already made a point of order on the whole amendment on the ground that it involves new legislation in contravention of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI. The point of order I make is that the Senator from Georgia cannot supersede the point of order of the Senator from Virginia by a different point of order which has to do with the question of germaneness. The rule provides for a different treatment as between the point of order on the ground of new legislation, and the point of order on the ground of germaneness. My point of order is that the point of order involving the question of new legislation,

already having been made by the Senator from Virginia, it cannot be superseded and put aside by the Senator from Georgia raising the question of relevancy.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. A parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming will state it.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Am I correct in understanding that the original point of order which was raised by the Senator from Virginia was based upon the interpretation of paragraphs 2 and 4 of rule XVI? My reason for asking the question is that paragraph 4 of rule XVI is the one which raises the question of relevancy. If the point of order of the Senator from Virginia was based upon paragraph 4 for the purpose of raising the question of relevancy, then the question has already been raised.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if the Senator will permit, the point of order of the Senator from Virginia refers to paragraph 4 of rule XVI and has to do with the first two lines, which read as follows:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Now, under that the amendment is certainly subject to a point or order.

Another ground is contained in paragraph 4—an entirely different ground—which relates to the question of germaneness. It reads as follows:

Nor shall any amendment not germane or relevant to the subject matter contained in the bill be received; nor shall any amendment to any item or clause of such bill be received which does not directly relate thereto, and all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. President, that provision as to submission to the Senate does not apply to the first ground for the point of order under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, which was the ground relied upon by the Senator from Virginia in his point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, on a parliamentary question I am always unhappy to be placed in a contrary position to that assumed by the Senator from Missouri, who is an able parliamentarian, but in this case I must disagree with him most heartily. There is no question that section 4 is complete. The question as to whether or not the amendment is general legislation, as I have insisted, applies only as to whether it is substantially new legislation; and the question of relevancy is one that addresses itself as to whether or not the proposal which is offered is relevant to the legislative proposition which it seeks to amend. I have insisted all the way through that it is entirely relevant because of the fact that the Bankhead-Jones Act, which was approved July 22, 1937, provides for the rehabilitation loans which are carried in this provision as well as for the tenant purchase loans which are carried in it.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, does the Senator say that he is relying upon the Bankhead-Jones bill which was approved in 1937?

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not rely upon it. I say that we escape the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia that we are proposing new general legislation, because the House has already legislated on this subject, and having opened the door, even by one-half inch, the Senate has a right to march in as a body, if it sees fit, so long as the amendment approved by the Senate is relevant and germane to the House provision.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator relies upon the authorization of loans to provide rural rehabilitation under the act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation; but that corporation has never been created—it is a dormant corporation.

Mr. RUSSELL. The corporation was never created; but I have undertaken to point out—and I will read the entire act if Senators wish—that its creation was wholly discretionary with the Secretary of Agriculture. Title I provides for the farm-tenant purchase loans. Title II provides for the rehabilitation loans, just as is suggested in this amendment. Title IV provides for the Farmers' Home Corporation. I want to read from title IV to show that really the question of the Farmers' Home Corporation has nothing to do with this question:

(b) The Secretary shall have power to delegate to the corporation such powers and duties conferred upon him under title I or title II or both.

It says he shall have the power to do it, but there is nothing in the act which requires him to do it. As a matter of fact, he has never proceeded under the powers which were conferred upon him by the Congress in title I and title II. Mr. President, we have heard argument raised here not only as to the sanctity of the appropriation bill, which has carried this provision for some 4 or 5 years, but as to the time limitation that is involved. I wish to point out that not only has this provision been in the bill for years but it was submitted in the Budget estimates to the Congress for the current year. This question has not been voted on up or down on the floor of either body of the Congress.

I say, Mr. President, not only is the question of relevancy involved but that we ought to face this issue squarely and determine whether or not this program, which has been in effect for some 6 or 8 years, shall be discontinued on a point of order which is raised by one Member of the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair). Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand the Senator to say that the item was contained in the Budget estimates. The Senator does not mean to state to the Senate, does he, that the legislation contained in this amendment was also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes; I do.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Does the Senator mean to say that all these provisions were in the Budget estimates?

Mr. RUSSELL. They were submitted this year, and last year, and passed both bodies.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Where did the Budget Bureau get the authority in submitting items of appropriation to submit legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senator will pardon me, I should not like to be diverted to the question of the authority of the Budget Bureau. I was merely answering the Senator's argument that this was an entirely new proposition which we were trying to railroad through.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator said the amendment in its present form was submitted by the Bureau of the Budget.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not say that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I am bound by what the Senator says because he has the information and I have not.

Mr. RUSSELL. I did not mean to say that it is in the identical form suggested by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. The Senator admits it is legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Was the legislation, as well as the estimate, submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language of the amendment which refers to the authority to borrow from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was contained in the language submitted by the Budget Bureau.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. As to the other legislative provisions, such as those requiring reports and as to personnel—

Mr. RUSSELL. No.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. And as to loans, and also the provision on page 90 down to line 5 on page 91, were they also submitted by the Budget?

Mr. RUSSELL. The language on page 90 from line 18 to line 12 on page 91 was submitted by the Budget.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. So that the Budget is now itself submitting legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. I assume that that language was inserted by the Budget because of the fact that the Congress had put that language in the bill for several years. The amendment may be legislation, but it is all relevant to the House provision. The Budget submitted language providing for the prosecution of the 195 rural rehabilitation projects which have, in one manner or another, come under the jurisdiction of the Farm Security Administration. I do not wish to debate the details of those projects because they are not pertinent to this discussion, but I should like to say for the benefit of those who have condemned the Farm Security Administration because of rural rehabilitation projects that only 8 out of 195 were inaugurated by the Farm Security Administration. The remainder have been inherited either from the Resettlement Administration, which was directed one time by Mr. Tugwell, or from the several State corporations which were established for resettlement under the Work Projects Act.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. TAFT. The effect, I understand, if the point of order were sustained, would not be to eliminate the Farm Security Administration but would be to send the bill back to the committee, and I presume the committee could eliminate all legislative matters and report it back with an appropriation of, say, \$50,000,000 tomorrow, even though the point of order is sustained. I do not think it is quite fair to say that this is a method simply to eliminate the F. S. A. It seems to me that it is rather a method of holding it within the original legislative authority of \$50,000,000.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator now is referring to the tenant purchase program and not to the rehabilitation program. There are some \$400,000,000 of loans outstanding on that program on which I think the Government has some claim and on which I believe it will make collections.

Mr. TAFT. I was intending to refer to the rural rehabilitation section, section 6, title I.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no earthly way that this bill can be reported back to the Senate with any provision for the liquidation of these projects which is not in some respects legislative, because it would be necessary to provide, if for nothing else, for collecting the loans made by the predecessor of the Farm Security Administration, which would be legislation. I insist it makes no difference about it being legislation, for if the House of Representatives puts just one thin string of legislation in the bill, omitting, as it does, section 6 of the act, the Senate has a right to legislate thereon, and the only question that can possibly be raised against the committee amendment is whether or not it is relevant and germane to the House amendment, and, as to that, I think there can be no doubt.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I should like to make clear exactly the point I made. I read paragraph 2 of rule XVI:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations.

I next read the first two lines of paragraph 4:

No amendment which proposes general legislation shall be received to any general appropriation bill.

Mr. President, I desire to advert to the claim made by the Senator from Georgia that he relies for authorization for rural rehabilitation loans and grants upon the law which is entitled:

An act to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to provide more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present

forms of farm tenancy, and for other purposes.

The Senator from Georgia did not inform the Senate that the Farmers' Home Corporation has never been organized; it is dormant; it has never been put into operation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. I made no contention that we were relying upon the Farmers' Home Corporation. I said specifically on the floor that that organization was to be established, under the powers delegated, in the discretion of the Secretary of Agriculture. It has never been established, and the powers contained in the Farmers' Home Corporation Act have no connection with the powers contained in titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenancy Act. It is stated in the first paragraph of the act on which I am relying that—

This act may be cited as the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will permit me to finish, I will make my point.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am sorry.

Mr. BYRD. In response to a question from the Senator from Virginia, the Senator stated a few moments ago that he did rely upon this act for the authorization of the loans and grants for rural rehabilitation. In section 21 of the act it is provided:

Out of the funds made available under section 23, the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs (including minor improvements and minor repairs to real property), and for the financing of indebtedness, and for family subsistence.

Let me call the attention of the Senator to section 23, which provides:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938—

Remember, this corporation has not even been organized, and is not operating—

the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order No. 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order No. 7557 of February 19, 1937, which are expended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Of course, there are no such funds available now. That was on June 30, 1937. Those balances have been used for other purposes. Then paragraph (b) provides:

The President is authorized to allot to the Secretary, out of appropriations made for relief or work relief for any fiscal year ending prior to July 1, 1939, such sums as he determines to be necessary to carry out the provisions of this title.

There will be no funds after July 1 that are going to be appropriated for relief or work relief.

Section 6 of the act provides:

To carry out the provisions of this title, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed \$10,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, not to exceed \$25,000,000 for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939, and not to exceed \$50,000,000 for each fiscal year thereafter.

No part of that has been appropriated.

Mr. President, I think that during my membership in the Senate I have never known a more strained construction placed upon the rule relating to legislative provisions—for that is what it is in this appropriation bill—than to rely upon an act which creates a corporation which has not even been organized, which is still dormant, still inactive, and then to rely upon appropriations which are not available at this time.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Virginia yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. BYRD. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. Is it the opinion of the able Senator that if the point of order made by him were sustained it would knock out of this appropriation bill all funds for the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. No; the opinion of the Senator from Virginia is that the bill, under paragraph 2 of rule XVI, would go back to the committee and be reported back to the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. If the Senate Committee on Appropriations was not able to insert the provision in the appropriation bill when it had the bill before it, how would it be able to insert it on any other occasion?

Mr. BYRD. It could insert it if it did not provide for general legislation, and if it did, then the alternative is to present a motion for a suspension of the rules, as the Senator from Georgia has done in a number of other instances in connection with the same bill.

Mr. PEPPER. If the rule were to be suspended, would that require a two-thirds vote?

Mr. BYRD. It would; the requirement is the same as to all other legislative provisions. If the Senate rule means anything, it means that.

Mr. PEPPER. That would mean that an appropriation for the Farm Security Administration would require a vote of two-thirds of the Senate, whereas if the point of order should not be sustained then the item could be preserved in the bill by only a majority.

Mr. BYRD. It will do one of two things, it will either require the Senate rule to be carried out, namely, to return the bill to the Committee on Appropriations, or require a suspension of the rules by a two-thirds vote.

Mr. PEPPER. In the opinion of the able Senator from Virginia, is it necessary that the provisions accompanying the item here in dispute must be contained in the bill in order to effectuate the continuation of the Farm Security Administration?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator should ask someone who favors the Farm Security Administration. I do not know. I know that in my judgment the provision does contain legislation. It is in defiance of the Senate rules, and should be treated as such. If the Senate wishes to suspend the rule, as the Senator from Georgia has asked in regard to a number of other legislative matters, which will be included in the bill, that is the privilege of the Senate. If the Senate

does not wish to suspend the rule, it should permit the bill to go back to the Committee on Appropriations, in accordance with the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER. Has not the Senator already stated that if it went back to the Committee on Appropriations, the committee still could not insert the provision subject to the point of order?

Mr. BYRD. Of course, it could not insert legislative provisions, any more than it can now.

Mr. PEPPER. What the able Senator from Virginia means, then, is that this matter should go back to the Committee on Appropriations and should not come before the Senate under any circumstances except in such form as will require two-thirds of the Senate to pass it?

Mr. BYRD. Does the Senator approve of the Senate rule which prohibits—

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President—

Mr. BYRD. Let me ask the Senator a question. He asked me several questions, and I should like to ask him one. Does the Senator approve the Senate rule which prohibits general legislation on appropriation bills?

Mr. PEPPER. As a general matter; yes.

Mr. BYRD. Why as a general matter? It has to apply to all matters or none.

Mr. PEPPER. The case now before the Senate I think certainly presents a close question, about which the Senate is entitled to exercise its discretion in passing on the point of order. I am very much persuaded by the reasonableness of the explanation made by the able junior Senator from Georgia that this is not new legislation since similar legislation has been on the statute books for 4 or 5 years.

If the Senator will permit me to ask him one last question, did I understand him to say that he opposed the Farm Security Administration being continued?

Mr. BYRD. I am in favor of transferring the operations of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration. There is no secret about it. I am the chairman of a committee that brought in such a recommendation a year ago. The Senator is well informed about that.

Mr. PEPPER. If I did not misunderstand, I thought I heard the Senator say a moment ago that that could be answered by someone who favored—

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether the Committee on Appropriations could bring back an amendment containing legislative provisions. I am not on the Committee on Appropriations, and I did not think it was proper for me to answer that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Was it the thought of the able Senator from Virginia that if the transfer of the Farm Security Administration to the Farm Credit Administration were made, the functions which previously had been exercised by the Farm Security Administration would continue to be exercised?

Mr. BYRD. That is my contention.

Mr. PEPPER. The Senator did not expect to diminish any of the activities—

Mr. BYRD. I did not say they should not be diminished. I think the appropriations should be cut down, but I say that as to the permanent activities of the Farm Security Administration—and the debate on that will come later—they should be transferred to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, when the Senate passes upon the point of order it is doing something far more extensive than passing on the rules of the Senate. What it is actually doing is depriving over 450,000 farm families, scattered all over the United States, practically of the means of subsistence above the level of impoverishment and squalor. As a matter of fact, the very condition under which the loans in question have been made to the Farm Security Administration tenants is that they cannot get funds from any other source. This is their alternative, their only hope. Take this privilege away from them, and they are left utterly destitute.

These loan provisions not only make it possible for workers to produce for the war, but involved in the item which is under attack here now by the able Senator from Virginia, who has been frank in his expression of not particularly favoring continuance of the Farm Security Administration, is opportunity for hospitalization, opportunity for some medical service, opportunity for some dental service, opportunity to obtain seed with which to plant their crops, opportunity to get a new cow if the only cow they possess dies, a new mule if the mule they have passes away, or the very food necessary for the nourishment of their families. All these would be taken away on a point of order by the remote Senate of the United States.

I say remote, Mr. President, because I doubt if we were to walk over the threshold of one of those dependent families and face the issue of depriving them of that succor which is all they have, or sustaining the principle of a point of order relative to parliamentary procedure, I doubt if many of us could make the decision in favor of the parliamentary technicality under the Senate rule against the lives and living conditions of those American families.

Mr. President, remember, if we had before us the statistics of the Selective Service, we would find that many a boy in the front lines comes from one of those homes, and if this point of order is sustained, it means that his mother and father and his brothers and sisters behind will be deprived of means and sustenance, because of a point of parliamentary procedure.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. BYRD. I do not admit that what the Senator from Florida says is correct. The Senator has no right to say that by the transfer of these activities to the Farm Credit Administration this great mass of citizens will be denied any relief or succor of any kind.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. RUSSELL. The Senator from Virginia, of course, knows that if this is legislation it is certainly legislation to undertake to transfer these functions to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. BYRD. Let us have such a provision in a legislative bill.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is much more violative of the Senate rules than the provision now under consideration, which is predicated on the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. BYRD. The provision can be placed in a legislative bill. I cannot permit to go uncontradicted the broad statement made by the Senator from Georgia. It is not correct.

Mr. RUSSELL. It could not be done in this bill, I said. The Senator knows that if this provision is subject to a point of order, certainly if we were to attempt to transfer all these functions under titles I and II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, it would be subject to a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a motion to suspend the rule and make this subject matter in order would certainly be in order before the Senate, and if the motion to suspend the rule to adopt the committee amendment were adopted, then any other germane amendment would be in order to that, and the whole question would be before the Senate, but that would be in accordance with the rules of the Senate instead of being in derogation of the rules.

Mr. PEPPER. But, Mr. President, the able Senator from Missouri would readily admit that a two-thirds vote of the Senate would be required in order to do that.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Certainly. That is what the rules of the Senate provide. The Senator from Florida always comes in and deplores something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or prohibited by the Constitution of the United States, or by the laws of the United States.

Mr. PEPPER. No, I am not deploring something because it is prohibited by the rules of the Senate, or by the Constitution of the United States. I am deploring the poverty in the homes of Farm Security Administration tenants, and I am saying that the Senate does not have to take away from them their sole means of succor upon the parliamentary point which is presented here today, which is a mere technicality about which honest men may have a difference of opinion.

Mr. President, if this were an effort made flagrantly in the face of some direct provision of the rule of the Senate, or of the Constitution, that might present a different case. We lawyers always have heard it said that hard cases make bad law. But there are precedents which justify the item which the Appropriations Committee of the Senate has brought to the Senate today. There is certainly a reasonable difference of opinion as to whether or not this is new legislation. Everyone knows it is not new legislation to keep the Farm Security Administration in existence. It is simply a continuation of that agency, and its functions, which is proposed by this

amendment. That is the substance of it. After all, even a court of law is justified in looking behind the technicality, through the veil of technicality, and looking at the substance which is behind. If this were some irrelevant and extraneous matter which was brought here that would be different, but there is not an item, as I understand, that is involved in the point of order which is not a proposed continuation of what has been going on heretofore. The able Senator from Virginia was correct in saying that this matter should be handled by new legislation. Yet the able Senator from Virginia would not tell his colleagues that he proposes any such legislation now. I am not at all sure—

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I will be glad to propose legislation to make transfer to the Farm Credit Administration.

Mr. PEPPER. But would that not be legislation?

Mr. BYRD. The Senator asked me whether I was willing to propose such legislation, and I said I was.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator contemplate the introduction of any such legislation if the item in question is knocked out?

Mr. BYRD. I have not given consideration to that question.

Mr. PEPPER. Will the Senator propose to destroy this item without introducing legislation to take care of the situation?

Mr. BYRD. Wait a moment. I will agree to introduce legislation tomorrow.

Mr. PEPPER. How long does the able Senator from Virginia think it will take to have such legislation adopted?

Mr. BYRD. The judgment of the Senator from Florida is as good as my judgment with respect to that matter. I think we can succeed in passing such legislation with the assistance of the able Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. But the Senator proposes to diminish the Farm Security Administration as it now exists. It is not the present Farm Security Administration, with its present functions, that the Senator proposes to continue. It is something else.

Mr. BYRD. Of course, I do not propose to continue the present Farm Security Administration. If I did I would vote for this amendment.

Mr. PEPPER. Very well. I think the Senator from Virginia has made clear that he is against the Farm Security Administration. Therefore he proposes to knock it out on a point of order.

Mr. BYRD. I resent that statement. I have a high regard for the rules of the Senate. I regard this proposal as being contrary to the rules of the Senate, and as a Senator I have a right to invoke the rules of the Senate without having my motives impugned.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think it is news to any Member of the Senate that the Senator from Virginia has not been generally favorable to the Farm Security Administration. I do not deny the Senator's right to feel the way he does.

Mr. BYRD. I have never denied that I am opposed to the waste and extrava-

gance in the Farm Security Administration, which is the greatest in any single bureau of the Government, and I will attempt to discuss that matter when the occasion to do so is presented. But when the Senator from Florida says I am prompted primarily by my opposition to the Farm Security Administration when, as a matter of fact, I am attempting to make certain that the rules of the Senate shall be sustained, he is incorrect in his statement.

Mr. PEPPER. I wish to do the Senator from Virginia, for whom I have the highest respect, no disservice. I thought it was a matter of common knowledge that the able Senator from Virginia did not agree with many of us in our esteem for the Farm Security Administration. I believe in it, and want to continue it. If I had the power I would increase its appropriation instead of diminishing it.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Florida would be willing to continue it even in defiance of the rules of the Senate, as I understand. That is the difference between the Senator from Florida and the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. PEPPER. I will say, Mr. President, that if I have on the one hand the proposal to take away from nearly one-half million American farm families the opportunity they have to borrow a single dollar to buy a new mule, or a new cow, or the seed to go in the ground, or the money with which to harvest their crops, or the few dollars with which to pay a doctor or a dentist, or go to the hospital, or with which to buy food or to continue engaging in producing for the war itself, with a good record in producing food for the war—if that proposal were submitted on the one hand, and on the other I have before me a doubtful question of parliamentary technicality to decide, I should certainly resolve that doubt, Mr. President, in favor of the 450,000 farm families, and trust the Senate to preserve the integrity of its own parliamentary rules.

For I know, Mr. President, and every other Senator on the floor knows in his conscience, that if this item is knocked out of the bill today, if the point of order shall be sustained, it will mean that on the 1st of July the functions of the Farm Security Administration will terminate, and there will not be adopted by the Senate or the House any new legislation continuing those functions.

So, Mr. President, we are in substance voting on the square-cut, clear-cut issue of whether we are going to destroy, on the basis of a technicality, the Farm Security Administration, or whether we are going to resolve the doubt in favor of this item, which comes to the Senate not from a single Senator, but from one of the most distinguished committees of the Senate. We are voting on whether we are going to resolve the doubt against the technicality and in favor of the 450,000 needy farm families scattered all over America, with a creditable record of producing for the war and a finer record of sending their sons to fight in the war, or whether we are going to sit here as if we were automatons, as if we had no people's lives on our consciences and say, "Well, at all events, whatever be the con-

sequence, we have got to maintain the technicalities of the Senate rules against one of the Senate's own committees, and against a rational and reasonable difference of opinion between parliamentary experts on the legality of this item."

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. PEPPER. I yield.

Mr. WHEELER. Let me preface my remarks by saying that I shall vote for the farm security proposal. I am in favor of it. However, I am wondering whether the statement made by the Senator from Florida is accurate—that if the proposal is voted down, that will be the end of the farm-security activities. I did not so understand the statement made the other day by the distinguished chairman of the subcommittee. I felt that if this item should be voted down, the Senator would offer an amendment increasing the amount of the appropriation for the Farm Security Administration, to be obtained from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, or appropriating the money directly from the Treasury. Am I correct or incorrect in that respect?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield to me, let me say that I think it would be next to impossible to continue the Farm Security Administration without having some of the provisions of the amendment which are in the nature of legislation. There is no question that the provision for borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is legislation. There is no question that the Senate committee provision requiring the liquidation of the Rural Rehabilitation projects is legislation. My position is that if the House has legislated on these questions, as it unquestionably has done in this bill, the Senate has a right to legislate on them. I shall never admit that when a legislative matter comes from the other body on an appropriation bill, the Senate is tied hand and foot, and is limited to striking out the provision. Legislation coming to us, as a House of equal dignity with the other House, certainly gives us the right to take action similar to that taken by the other body.

Mr. President, I think sustaining the point of order would be very likely to relegate provision for continuing the functions of the Farm Security Administration to legislation; it would have to pursue all the courses of legislation; and, in effect, in view of the fact that the appropriation expires by the 1st of July, it would mean the death of the Farm Security Administration as such.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that the point I have in mind is whether the Senator would be able to submit to the appropriation bill an amendment providing the necessary money.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no trouble about the legislative sanction for the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. WHEELER. I see.

Mr. RUSSELL. But if the rehabilitation program is to be carried on as it is now carried on, legislation would be required in order to grant leave to borrow

from the R. F. C. or to exceed the appropriation which has been allowed.

The Senator from Virginia read the list of allocations which have been made under that act for the maintenance of that work. I freely concede that all the funds for that work have been expended, or practically so; a very small balance remains. But the Appropriations Committee, as I understand, has a right to exceed the authorization under the bill. I do not think that question is now involved.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator will yield to me, let me say that a direct appropriation for that purpose, instead of a provision granting authority to borrow from the R. F. C., would not be legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. BYRD. But the Senator from Montana said there was no way around the difficulty, without enacting legislation.

Mr. RUSSELL. I say that, as a practical matter, with the time now remaining in which it will be possible to provide a direct appropriation for these purposes, and with the opposition which already has been evinced across the Capitol to these matters, it would be impossible to obtain such legislation.

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, what I am attempting to find out, and what is confusing to me, is whether we could not appropriate the amount of money required to carry on these necessary operations, without involving the question of legislation. I do not care whether the money is taken from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, provided the Congress directs that that be done or whether it is taken directly from the Treasury of the United States. Either one procedure or the other would have the same result. What I am wondering is whether, by increasing the appropriations and by writing in the bill an amendment to the appropriation items of the bill, we could not accomplish the same purpose.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, if the Senator will further yield, let me say that I think we undoubtedly would have a right to make direct appropriations for most of those functions. We could not liquidate the resettlement projects, nor could they be carried on, by provisions under the appropriation. We could not either maintain or liquidate them without having direct legislation. But so far as direct loans to the farmers are concerned, I think we could make them under the provisions of this act. We could not, except by legislation, take care of any grants to farmers who have been subjected to losses caused by the ravages of floods in recent months; because an authorization to do that would be in excess of the powers contained in title II of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, I thank both Senators for what they have said. I shall conclude what I have to say. I am not an expert on these matters, but I have been in the homes of farmers receiving such aid, and I know what will happen if the aid is cut off. I know that the consensus is that sustaining the point of order would jeopardize, if it would

not absolutely assure cutting off, the services rendered farmers by the Farm Security Administration.

Mr. President, from time to time the Senate has voted on the question of sustaining points of order. If the question is a close one, sometimes the Senate has gone on one side of the line, and sometimes on the other side of the line. There is no flat or fixed rule on the subject. Certainly the House of Representatives has opened the doors to this irregularity, if it is one, by legislating on the subject first. The Senate Appropriations Committee did not inaugurate the delinquency, if it is one. Our committee is simply building on what the House did. I believe there are in this body a sufficient number of able Senators to protect the integrity of our rules. I simply submit that in a case of this sort, one which means so much to so many people, if there is any possible doubt about the decision we should make, it is better to bend a little on the side of humanity and the preservation of lives and the standard of living, meager as it is, of these 450,000 families, than to sit back as if we lived in a vacuum, and wash our hands, like Pilate, of the decision, and say, "I shall have nothing to do with this matter because to give these people help offends my sense of discretion and judgment about what should be done on this technical point under the parliamentary rules of the Senate."

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, I should like to have the attention of the Senator from Georgia for a moment so that I may obtain his thought on this matter.

Under title II—Rehabilitation Loans, subtitle "Borrowers and Terms," subsection 21 (a) reads as follows:

Out of the funds made available under section 23 the Secretary shall have power to make loans to eligible individuals for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and for other farm needs—

And so forth.

I repeat the first words:

Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Now, turning to section 23, the title of which is "Appropriation," we find that subsection (a) reads as follows:

For the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938, the balances of funds available to the Secretary for loans and relief to farmers, pursuant to Executive Order Numbered 7530 of December 31, 1936, as amended by Executive Order Numbered 7557 of February 19, 1937—

Mark this well, Mr. President—

which are unexpended on June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this title.

Having quoted those two provisions, let me say that of course the Senator knows, as do all other Members of the Senate, that the funds which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937, have been exhausted. Is not that correct?

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not sure that all of them have been exhausted. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. Yes.

Mr. RUSSELL. Prior to the creation of the Resettlement Administration un-

der W. P. A., State corporate organizations for rural resettlement and rehabilitation were set up. Some of those funds are still available in the States, but the amount is very small.

Mr. TYDINGS. I have been advised that the funds have been expended.

Mr. RUSSELL. They are practically exhausted.

Mr. TYDINGS. They are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. TYDINGS. If those are the funds which were authorized to carry out the provisions of the act, and were the funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937, they are the only funds authorized, because, turning back to rehabilitation loans, the first line reads:

Out of funds made available under section 23—

I have just read section 23. Therefore it seems to me to follow, regardless of the merits of the Farm Security Administration's program, whether we are for it or against it, the language and the import of the language are definitely clear. The only funds authorized by act of Congress to carry out the provisions of this act were those which were unexpended as of June 30, 1937.

I am arguing this question in good faith. I am not trying to take any technical advantage of the law; but I am trying to find out what the law is. Before the Senator comments, I wish to commend him for his candor in answering the inquiries of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Virginia. In my judgment he was completely honest in his answer to those inquiries and did not reserve anything which might have been in his favor when he said that legislation was necessary to do some of the things he enumerated.

Mr. RUSSELL. There is no question about that.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am glad the Senator is candid, because we can arrive at a decision when men are candid.

Mr. RUSSELL. I always try to be candid in dealing with the Senate not only in connection with this bill but in all other matters. I have not reserved anything, and have no intention of doing so. In the first place, I have no motive for doing so, because I think we can legislate as far as we want to go under the rules.

Mr. TYDINGS. I rose to ask the Senator only this question: As I understand, the Senator does not take issue with what I have presented, but he does say that inasmuch as the House has legislated he feels at liberty to carry out that legislation?

Mr. RUSSELL. Exactly.

Mr. TYDINGS. But if the House had not legislated, a point of order would lie because, unless the rule were waived, there would be no reason why the Senate Appropriations Committee should put in the bill the provision referred to. The Senator feels that, the House having adopted a provision relating to the subject, the Senate has a right to proceed.

Mr. RUSSELL. There are some legislative provisions in this amendment. I made that statement in the very first

moments of my remarks when I presented my views on the point of order. There are undoubtedly some legislative provisions. The provision which requires the liquidation of farm security projects is legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. I wished to direct my attention to this one provision.

Mr. RUSSELL. I am not impressed with the argument of the Senator from Maryland that because of the limitations in section 23 we cannot make appropriations. Of course, the Senator is familiar with the rule that the Committee on Appropriations may recommend appropriations in excess of the authorization, so long as the purposes of the appropriation are defined by legislation.

Mr. TYDINGS. That is correct; but let me ask the Senator what is the authorization, if we strike down section 21, entitled "Rehabilitation Loans"?

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not think it is stricken down—not by the point which the Senator raises.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point I am raising, to make it specific, is that when we see what that authorization is we find these words:

Out of the funds made available under section 23.

Therefore no other funds were made available, and the committee had no right to legislate funds into the bill unless they were in accordance with the authorization.

Mr. RUSSELL. I do not understand that to be the determining factor as a limitation on the committee. If, instead, the language read, "Not to exceed \$1,000,000 shall be appropriated to the Secretary for these purposes," under rule XVI the Senate committee would have a right to recommend an appropriation of \$5,000,000 for that purpose, so long as it was recommended for purposes which were authorized by law.

I do not think that that point is as pertinent as is the objection which has been raised to the legislative provisions of the amendment. But whether it is or not, I take the ground—and I have never been more convinced that I am right from a parliamentary standpoint—that if the House legislates on the subject, even to the slightest degree, the Senate has the right to canvass the whole field and take away from, add to, explain, expand, or contract that which the House has done in dealing with the matter, subject only to the rule as to whether it is relevant or germane to the action the House has taken.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I inquire whether all this debate is not out of order, unless the Chair wishes to be informed. I ask the Chair whether he needs any more information.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule whenever the Senate is through undertaking to advise the Chair.

Mr. TYDINGS. Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, I have not the slightest disposition to delay the Senate. However, in reading the law I could not

find any authorization for the committee action. The law provides that out of funds made available under section 23 these things may be done.

What is section 23? It provides that only moneys which are unexpended as of June 30, 1937, are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of this act.

I believe that if the question were submitted to the parliamentarian he would agree with the point which I have made. The Senator from Georgia does not let that point be the determining factor in arriving at his conclusion. The Senator from Georgia takes a new position, which he has a right to take, namely, that the House has legislated—

Mr. RUSSELL. I have not taken any new position. I have insisted on that position from the beginning.

Mr. TYDINGS. I am not saying this in criticism. I believe that the point is material, because the law provides that no funds may be used which were not then expended as of June 30, 1937. The first provision of the law says that only out of funds made available under section 23 may these activities be carried on. Section 23 provides that no funds may be used for these purposes except the unexpended balances which existed on June 30, 1937.

Mr. RUSSELL. If the Senate has a right to provide that such funds shall be borrowed from the R. F. C., it has a right to change that language.

Mr. TYDINGS. I do not know that I would agree to the statement that the Senate has that right, because borrowing is only another way of appropriating.

Mr. RUSSELL. I was predicating my statement on the assumption that the Senate has the right.

Mr. TYDINGS. The point remains that the authority for the purchase of livestock, farm equipment, supplies, and other farm needs relates only to funds made available under section 23; and section 23 very clearly states that no money shall be used for such purposes except funds which were unexpended on June 30, 1937. Such funds are authorized to be appropriated to carry out the provisions of the act.

It seems clear to me, therefore, that there is no legislative authority for the provisions written into the bill. As to whether or not the House, by writing in the legislative provision, has given the Senate the right to go ahead, I am not discussing that point at this time. I do not think it has; but aside from that point, there is no clear authority for the appropriation of these funds.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, may I ask the very patient and distinguished Senator in charge of the bill another question on the subject of germaneness?

Mr. RUSSELL. Certainly.

Mr. TAFT. It occurs to me that the two sections of the Bankhead-Jones Act, one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other to tenant loans, are distinct measures, and that in this case the House, by its alleged violation of the tenant-purchase section, may have opened up the tenant-purchase end of the question; but I do not see how it could have opened up the rural rehabili-

tation loan question. In other words, I do not see that this is, in fact, germane to the matter which the House has opened up. Will the Senator give us his views on that question?

Mr. RUSSELL. In my opening statement I suggested that that question might arise in the minds of some Members of the Senate. I stated that, in my opinion, so long as we dealt with the general subject of rural rehabilitation loans, we were clearly within the rights and powers of the Senate. That is a question which addresses itself to the discretion of each Senator. In my judgment, the entire committee amendment is absolutely germane to the purposes of rural rehabilitation and farm tenancy.

Mr. TAFT. Are not the two matters distinct?

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. TAFT. Does not the Senator regard the farm-tenancy program as separate from the rural rehabilitation-loan program?

Mr. RUSSELL. In connection with what I said in my opening remarks, I read both title I and title II as being the legislative background.

Mr. TAFT. But as I understand, the alleged violation of the House relates only to the tenant-purchase program.

Mr. RUSSELL. I freely grant that, but I am happy that the Senator admits that it is a violation, because if the House is guilty of a violation in regard to the tenant-purchase program, the whole question of rural rehabilitation is open to the Senate. There is no way on earth to escape that conclusion.

I invite the Senator's attention to the language which appears in the title of the House provision. What does it say? It says farm tenancy. So long as we are dealing with the question of farm tenancy, and rehabilitation, whether the persons be sharecroppers or laborers, the Senate is not only within its full rights, but also its duty.

Mr. TAFT. I believe very strongly in the farm tenant purchase end of the program, but it is the rural rehabilitation program which I think is doubtful. I think the two are distinct. It seems to me that if the House has opened up only one of them by violating the rule with respect to tenancy, that cannot be said to open up to general legislation the whole subject of rural rehabilitation loans, the law regarding which the House has not violated in any way.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is the view of the Senator from Ohio. I entertain a contrary view. I think that when the House opens up this question, as it undoubtedly did, whether it was with respect to title I, title II, or any other part of the law pertaining to rural rehabilitation, the Senate has a right to legislate on that subject so long as the legislation is relevant to the whole question of rural rehabilitation. The Senator from Ohio has a perfect right to regard a part of it as being relevant and a part of it as not being relevant; but it is my firm conviction that if we reverse the precedents and say that we are not able at this hour to legislate, the Senate will surrender substantial rights, and the question will come back to plague and

hamper us. What is the danger in it? Let the Senate say whether or not it is relevant or not relevant, and what parts, if any, of these amendments should be adopted. If we place a limitation on our power by adopting the precedent suggested, in years to come the House will legislate and our hands will be tied by a limitation on our power which will enable us only to accept or reject a House legislative amendment to an appropriation bill.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I invite the attention of the Senate to paragraph 2 of rule XVI, which reads as follows:

The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be recommitted to the Committee on Appropriations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is ready to rule.

The present occupant of the chair will undertake to state the parliamentary situation as he understands it.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD] raised the point of order basing his objection, as he has said, on paragraph 2 of rule XVI, and, as the Chair understood, also on the first two lines of paragraph 4 of rule XVI.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I have restated the point of order. I rely exclusively on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It was the understanding of the Chair that the Senator relied also on the first two lines of paragraph 4. The Chair now understands that the Senator from Virginia relies only on paragraph 2 of rule XVI.

The Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] has raised the question of the relevancy of the committee amendment, based upon a part of the language of paragraph 4. The Chair will read a part of paragraph 4:

And all questions of relevancy of amendments under this rule, when raised, shall be submitted to the Senate and be decided without debate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair permit an interruption?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. He will.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I invite the attention of the Chair to the fact that when the question of relevancy was raised, not by the Senator from Georgia but by the then occupant of the chair, who is not now the occupant of the chair, I then made the point of order that the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, which had to do with new legislation, could not be superseded by a point of order having to do with relevancy under another clause of the rule.

I now call attention of the Chair to the fact that my point of order was the last point of order made, and therefore is the pending point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is mindful of what the Senator from Missouri has said, but feels that it is the duty of the Chair, under paragraph 4 of rule XVI, to submit the question to

the Senate. This question, under the rules of the Senate—which, by the way, are whatever a majority of the Senate determines at any particular time—is not debatable. The Chair therefore submits to the Senate this question: Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a point of order.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I renew my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is not debatable. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I do not desire to debate. I desire to renew my point of order. I make the point of order that the Chair, by his own action, is attempting to supersede the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia with another point of order. I make that point of order and ask for a ruling upon it from the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. In the opinion of the Chair, the Senator from Missouri is out of order. The Chair has submitted the question to the Senate.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not make a mistake when he submits a question to the Senate for its decision.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I insist on a ruling on my point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I suggest the absence of a quorum. Under the Constitution the Chair cannot overrule that point, although the present occupant of the Chair is likely to overrule anything.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Andrews	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scrugham
Bore	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Eyrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdock	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. RUSSELL. The question pending before the Senate submitted by the Chair

is as to the germaneness of the committee amendment, is it not?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Is the committee amendment relevant to the House language?

Mr. RUSSELL. And those who agree with the committee's action should vote "yea"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the Chair's understanding, if the yeas and nays are ordered, but the yeas and nays have not been ordered.

Mr. RUSSELL. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will state it.

Mr. BYRD. I inquire, Who made the point of order with respect to germaneness?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understands it was made by the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. BYRD. Did the Senator from Georgia make it? The clerk tells me he did not make it.

Mr. RUSSELL. I urged throughout my entire remarks that the only question possible could be that of germaneness.

Mr. BYRD. The Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. BYRD. The clerk tells me that the Senator from Georgia did not make the point of order. This is the most remarkable procedure I have ever known.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair ask the Senator from Georgia did he raise the question of relevancy?

Mr. RUSSELL. No. I contended throughout my entire argument that the amendment was relevant. That is my contention.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair understood the Senator from Georgia did raise the question. If he did not raise it, the Chair will not submit it.

Mr. BYRD. If the Senator from Georgia did make the point, it should be a matter of record. I ask that the record be read to see whether he made it.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I make the point of order that the amendment under consideration is relevant to the provision contained in the House bill.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I make the point of order that the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia cannot be supplanted by a point of order that the amendment is relevant.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit the question raised on the point of order by the Senator from Georgia, in view of the record that has been made.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RUSSELL. I have insisted that the only question to be submitted to the Senate was the question of relevancy.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The present occupant was not in the chair all the

time, but the present occupant of the chair was informed that the Senator from Georgia had raised a point of order, and the Chair has a written memorandum on his desk to the effect that the Senator from Georgia had raised the question of relevancy.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I do not know what the Journal shows, but the Record tomorrow will show, and all Senators who are present must know, that I have insisted all along that this amendment was relevant to the House provision. That is the sole ground I took.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will submit to the Senate the point of order made by the Senator from Virginia if the yeas and nays are ordered. Is the Senate ready for a vote?

Mr. LODGE. I ask that the question be stated.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia. The Chair will request that the point made by the Senator from Virginia be put in writing so that the clerk may read it to the Senate.

Mr. LUCAS. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Gurney	Overton
Austin	Hatch	Pepper
Bailey	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bankhead	Hayden	Reynolds
Barbour	Hill	Russell
Bilbo	Holman	Scruggs
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Shipstead
Buck	La Follette	Smith
Burton	Langer	Stewart
Bushfield	Lodge	Taft
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Okla.
Capper	McCarran	Thomas, Utah
Caraway	McClellan	Tobey
Chandler	McFarland	Tunnell
Chavez	McKellar	Tydings
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Vandenberg
Connally	Maloney	Van Nuys
Danaher	Maybank	Wallgren
Davis	Mead	Walsh
Eastland	Millikin	Wheeler
Ellender	Moore	Wherry
George	Murdoch	White
Gerry	Murray	Wiley
Gillette	Nye	Willis
Green	O'Daniel	Wilson
Guffey	O'Mahoney	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I merely wish to point out that the point of relevancy was raised by me, and I am sure the Record and Journal of the Senate will so show.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I am preparing the motion and will submit it in a moment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair say to the Senator from Virginia that the Senator from Georgia has now informed the Chair that the Record will show that he raised the point. If he raised the point, the Chair is of opinion that it ought to come in as it was originally presented, and, if he did not raise it, the Chair is of opinion that the point can be decided on the motion of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. I should be glad to let the Record be read, but every Senator

knows that my argument was that since the House has opened this question, the Senate amendment was relevant and germane.

Mr. BYRD. I ask that the Journal be read to determine whether or not the Senator from Georgia made the motion.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I do not see how the Senator from Georgia could have made the point of order, because the point of order would have had to be that the amendment was not germane. He certainly did not make such a point of order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Oh, no.

Mr. TAFT. He could not make the point of order that it was germane, because that is the question the Senate is required to determine.

Mr. RUSSELL. No; I do not understand that I was required to make a point of order. The only thing that was required of me was to make the contention that this amendment was germane to the House provision. That has been the basis of the argument I have made.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the same question can be decided on the point made by the Senator from Virginia. So the Chair wishes to submit it on the point of order of the Senator from Virginia in order that the Senate may have a direct vote on the question.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I think I have the right to know what the Journal shows, and I should like to know. I have not myself talked with the Journal clerk, but he is a gentleman of very high class who has kept the Journal for a long time, and I should like to know what the Journal shows on this question. As I have said, I have not talked with the Journal clerk. I should like to know what the Journal shows.

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, I submit the point of order in writing.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair state the point of order of the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, as a Member of the Senate, I should like to know what the Journal shows in regard to this matter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. As soon as the clerk reads, the Chair will hear the Senator from Georgia. The clerk will now read the point of order submitted by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD].

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

I make the point of order under Section 2, Rule XVI, that the pending amendment contains new legislation and is therefore, under the rules of the Senate, in violation of paragraph 2, rule XVI, which reads as follows:

"The Committee on Appropriations shall not report an appropriation bill containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, and if an appropriation bill is reported to the Senate containing amendments proposing new or general legislation, a point of order may be made against the bill, and if the point is sustained, the bill shall be re-committed to the Committee on Appropriations."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Now the Chair wishes to hear what the Journal shows with respect to the question of the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Yes; and I want to make a point of order against the point

of order, on the ground that it involves the relevancy of this entire matter. The whole matter of relevancy is involved, whether it is new legislation or not.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Let the Chair hear what the Journal shows.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BYRD makes point of order that matter inserted by committee was, under Rule XVI of the Standing Rules, general legislation and not authorized by existing law, on a general appropriation bill.

Mr. RUSSELL made point of order that the House of Representatives having inserted legislation in the bill on the floor of the House by making an appropriation in excess of the amount allowed for administrative expenses under the basic act, to provide for the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act of July 22, 1937, the committee amendment was germane and the Senate had the right to legislate on the subject matter.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I say that brings the whole question of relevancy before us, and I see no reason for deviating from the custom of the Senate. The rules have always provided that the question of relevancy in these matters should be submitted to the Senate, and I ask that the question of relevancy now be submitted by the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion now that upon the question of the Senator from Virginia the Senator from Georgia expressly stated he did not raise the question of relevancy, and the question of relevancy is not raised on the Journal.

Mr. RUSSELL. I make the point of order against the point of order of the Senator from Virginia that it should be decided on the question of relevancy of the committee amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of opinion that it is too late to make the point now, and the Chair is now going to submit the point of order raised by the Senator from Virginia.

Mr. TAFT. A parliamentary inquiry. The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio will state it.

Mr. TAFT. Is the Chair asking the opinion of the Senate on the point of order under rule XVI, and will a majority vote prevail no matter which of these questions is submitted?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That is the ruling of the Chair. The yeas and nays have been ordered.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, will the Chair state, for the information of the Senate, the effect of the vote, that is, the effect of a vote "yea" and the effect of a vote "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If the point of the Senator from Virginia shall be sustained, the bill will be re-committed to the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I understand that; but should a Senator desire to sustain the point of order of the Senator from Virginia, will he vote "yea" or "nay"?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question the Chair will submit to the Senate now is, Shall the point of order be sustained? Those who vote "yea" will

vote to sustain the point of order, those who vote "nay" will vote against it.

Mr. HILL. To overrule the point of order?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is correct. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. McCLELLAN (after voting in the negative). I have a general pair with the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON]. I am not advised how he would vote if present. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN], who, I am advised, if present would vote "nay," and permit my vote to stand.

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE], are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Florida [Mr. ANDREWS] is detained in an important committee meeting.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] is detained on important public business. I am advised that, if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent. I am advised that if present and voting, he would vote "nay."

The Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], who is detained on important public business is paired with the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE]. I am advised that if present and voting, the Senator from Maryland would vote "yea" and the Senator from West Virginia would vote "nay."

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], who if present, would vote "yea," is paired on this question with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER], who if present, would vote "nay."

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] would vote "nay" if present.

The Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] are members of the Truman committee and are attending its meeting in Kansas City.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The result was announced—yeas 23, nays 54, as follows:

YEAS—23

Bailey	Gillette	Taft
Barbour	Hawkes	Tobey
Buck	Lodge	Tydings
Bushfield	McFarland	Walsh
Byrd	Millikin	Wherry
Clark, Mo.	Moore	White
Eastland	Revercomb	Willis
Gerry	Smith	

NAYS—54

Alken	Hatch	O'Daniel
Austin	Heyden	O'Mahoney
Bankhead	Hill	Overton
Bilbo	Holman	Pepper
Bone	Johnson, Colo.	Reynolds
Burton	La Follette	Russell
Capper	Langer	Scruggs
Caraway	Lucas	Shipstead
Chandler	McCarran	Stewart
Chavez	McClellan	Thomas, Okla.
Connally	McKellar	Thomas, Utah
Danaher	McNary	Tunnell
Davis	Maloney	Vandenberg
Ellender	Maybank	Van Nuys
George	Mead	Wallgren
Green	Murdock	Wheeler
Guffey	Murray	Wiley
Gurney	Nye	Wilson

NOT VOTING—19

Andrews	Clark, Idaho	Reed
Ball	Downey	Robertson
Barkley	Ferguson	Thomas, Idaho
Brewster	Glass	Truman
Bridges	Johnson, Calif.	Wagner
Brooks	Kilgore	
Butler	Radcliffe	

So the Senate refused to sustain Mr. Byrd's point of order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate on the question. I merely wish to remark that the vote just taken is a complete illustration and justification of the statement I have often heard made by a great man in years gone by, that the Senate had very few rules and did not pay the slightest attention to the few it had.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I do not generally indulge in debating a question when it is once settled, but in view of the remarks made by the distinguished Senator from Missouri, I wish to state that an examination of the precedents of the Senate will show that the Senate, by an overwhelming vote, has sustained the universal precedents on the issue involved in this parliamentary question.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, if I may claim the floor again, since the Senator from Wisconsin brought the matter up, I undertake to say that the Senator cannot adduce one single precedent which is applicable to the present case, a case where the House has simply legislated with regard to one law—even if that should be legislation, which I deny, in this case—where it has been held that that action furnishes justification to the Senate, in derogation of the Senate rule, to legislate on an entirely

different question. That is the question presented here.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I have cited one case, and I could cite many others, and I pointed out that the Senator from Missouri in the discussion of this question has not cited a single precedent to support the position which he has taken.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President, I cited the Senate rule.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, do I correctly understand that the committee amendment under consideration begins on page 89 and continues to the third line on page 95? Is that all one committee amendment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Ohio is correct. The committee amendment ends in line 3 on page 95.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I ask for a division of the amendment. Perhaps the division should occur at the end of line 4 on page 93.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator place his suggestion in writing and send it to the desk?

Mr. TAFT. I would suggest that first we consider the part of the amendment striking out the language under the head of "Farm Tenancy", then the part under the head of "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation", and then on page 93 the part of the amendment under the heading "Farm Tenancy". There is a clear distinction between those parts of the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request made by the Senator from Ohio?

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the language in question is all one amendment, but I think the Senator from Ohio unquestionably has a right to ask for a division of the amendment, and I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment will be divided, as requested by the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. RUSSELL. I reiterate that I consider it to be all one amendment, but I have no objection to dividing it. In order to bring the matter to a clear parliamentary understanding, I ask that the Senator consider first the item on page 89, after line 3, to strike out the language under the heading "Farm tenancy."

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? None is heard.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is purely for the purpose of convenience. It is all one amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the first part of the committee amendment as it has been divided.

The CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, after line 3, it is proposed to strike out:

FARM TENANCY

Salaries and expenses: To enable the Secretary to carry into effect the provisions of title I of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, approved July 22, 1937 (7 U. S. C. 1000-1006), \$500,000 for necessary expenses in connection with the making of loans under title I of said act and the collection of moneys due the United States on account of loans heretofore made under the provisions of said act, including the employment of persons and means in the District of Columbia and elsewhere,

exclusive of printing and binding as authorized by said act.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment on page 89, beginning in line 4.

The amendment was agreed to.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the next portion of the amendment as it has been divided.

THE LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 89, after line 14, it is proposed to insert the following:

LOANS, GRANTS, AND RURAL REHABILITATION

To enable the Secretary to continue to provide assistance through rural rehabilitation and grants to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories, and possessions, including (1) farm debt adjustment service, and making and servicing of loans and grants under this and prior laws; (2) loans to needy individual farmers; (3) grants; and (4) liquidation as expeditiously as possible of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, \$29,607,573, which sum shall be also available for necessary administrative expenses incident to the foregoing, including personal services in the District of Columbia and elsewhere; compensation of experts (including the Administrator and not to exceed three Assistant Administrators of the Farm Security Administration) without regard to the Classification Act of 1923, as amended; purchase of lawbooks, books of reference, periodicals, and newspapers; purchase, operation, and maintenance of motor-propelled passenger-carrying vehicles; and printing and binding: *Provided*, That the War Food Administrator shall transmit to the Congress semiannually a progress report with respect to the liquidation of Federal rural rehabilitation projects under the supervision of the Farm Security Administration, showing by name and by States all dispositions of such projects, or parts thereof, together with the amounts of Federal funds expended in the process of liquidation, and any losses incurred in the use of such funds.

In making any grant payments under this act, the Secretary is authorized to require with respect to such payments the performance of work on useful public projects, Federal and non-Federal, including work on private or public land in furtherance of the conservation of natural resources, and the provisions of the act of February 15, 1934 (5 U. S. C. 796), as amended, relating to disability or death compensation, and benefits shall apply to those persons performing such work: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to any case coming within the purview of the workmen's compensation law of any State, Territory, or possession, or in which the claimant has received or is entitled to receive similar benefits for injury or death.

For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy individual farmers, the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$97,500,000. Such advances shall be made (1) with interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as secur-

ity for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase or leasing of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase or land-leasing program; (2) the carrying on of any operations in collective farming except for the liquidation as expeditiously as possible of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) the making of loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

The Secretary of Agriculture may expend funds administered by him as trustee under the various transfer agreements with the several State rural-rehabilitation corporations only for purposes for which funds made available under this caption may be expended, and the limitations applicable to such funds shall also be applicable to the expenditure of such trust funds by the Secretary of Agriculture.

The appropriation and authorization herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," shall constitute the total amount to be available for obligation under this heading during the fiscal year 1944 and shall not be supplemented by funds from any source.

No part of the appropriation herein made under the heading "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation" shall be available to pay the compensation of any person appointed in accordance with the civil-service laws.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection—

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I offer as a substitute for the committee amendment, the amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have stated.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. The substitute amendment offered by the Senator from Virginia will be stated.

THE CHIEF CLERK. On page 89, lines 16 to 24, and on page 90, lines 1 to 25, and on page 91, lines 1 to 25, and on page 92, lines 1 to 25, and on page 93, lines 1 to 4, inclusive, it is proposed to strike out the language therein appearing, and to insert the following:

LOANS AND RURAL REHABILITATION

Making and servicing loans: To enable the Secretary, through the Farm Credit Administration and through existing agencies under its supervision, including the Crop and Feed Loan Division and Production Credit Association, to administer all activities, projects, facilities, and functions heretofore carried on under the caption, "Loans, grants, and rural rehabilitation," the continuance of which is authorized under the terms of this appropriation, and to provide assistance to needy farmers in the United States, its Territories and possessions, unable to obtain credit elsewhere, through making and servicing of loans under this and prior law, \$12,000,000, of which \$8,000,000 shall be available to the Extension Service of the land-grant colleges in the States to provide such farm and home management assistance as may be necessary to borrowers: *Provided further*, That none of the funds herein appropriated or made available for these purposes shall be used for the maintenance or establishment of regional offices.

Loan fund: For additional funds for the purpose of making rural rehabilitation loans to needy farmers, the Reconstruction Finance

Corporation is authorized and directed to make advances to the Secretary of Agriculture upon his request in an aggregate amount of not to exceed \$40,000,000. Such advances shall be made: (1) With interest at the rate of 3 percent per annum payable semiannually; (2) upon the security of obligations acceptable to the Corporation heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Secretary pursuant to law; (3) in amounts which shall not exceed 75 percent of the then unpaid principal amount of the obligations securing such advances; and (4) upon such other terms and conditions, and with such maturities, as the Corporation may determine. The Secretary of Agriculture shall pay to the Corporation, currently as received by him, all moneys collected as payments of principal and interest on the loans made from the amounts so advanced or collected upon any obligations held by the Corporation as security for such advances, until such amounts are fully repaid. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Corporation is authorized and empowered to issue and to have outstanding at any one time under the provisions of law in force on the date this act takes effect is hereby increased by an amount sufficient to carry out the provisions of this paragraph.

None of the moneys appropriated or otherwise authorized under this caption ("Loans and rural rehabilitation") shall be used for (1) the purchase of land or for the carrying on of any land-purchase program; (2) for carrying on any experiment in collective farming, except for the liquidation of any such projects heretofore initiated; or (3) for making loans to any individual farmer in excess of \$2,500.

MR. BYRD. I ask unanimous consent that the amendment be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the amendment of the Senator from Virginia will be considered as a whole as a substitute for the committee amendment.

MR. BYRD. Mr. President, I ask the acting majority leader if he will not be willing to let the amendment be printed—it will create considerable discussion—and allow its consideration to go over until tomorrow. Obviously, we cannot conclude discussion of it this evening, and probably some other section of the bill could be taken up and disposed of today. I should like the Members of the Senate to have the benefit of having the amendment before them in printed form, and of having it available tomorrow.

MR. McNARY. Mr. President, I was interested in the amendment when it was read, but I could not follow it clearly. I should like to have its consideration go over until tomorrow, inasmuch as action on the bill cannot be concluded today.

MR. RUSSELL. Mr. President, of course, I would not undertake to oppose the wishes of the Senator from Oregon in this matter, because I know his views on the question. However, I understand that the amendment of the Senator from Virginia is practically the same as the House committee amendment, which went out on a point of order in the House. I think it is practically the same as the amendments proposed by the House committee, commonly known as the Farm

Bureau amendments, so far as the accomplishment of functions is concerned. I think most Members of the Senate have some familiarity with it.

Mr. McNARY. I could not tell from the reading; but I thought that probably its consideration could not be completed this afternoon; and probably we could take up some amendment not so controversial, and could consider the amendment of the Senator from Virginia tomorrow.

Mr. RUSSELL. I understand that the two remaining amendments—one relating to rural rehabilitation and the other authorizing borrowing from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to finance the Rural Electrification Administration—are controversial, as will be any amendments offered to them. If the Senator from Oregon desires to have the bill go over until tomorrow, I shall not interpose objection, but I should like to point out that whatever remains will be controversial. We shall not relieve ourselves of any controversy.

Mr. McNARY. I am satisfied that we can complete action on the bill tomorrow. It is now almost 5 o'clock, and many Members of the Senate have not had an opportunity to be in their offices today.

Mr. RUSSELL. I would not resist the request. I have no objection to having the Senate take a recess at this time.

REPORT FROM THE ALEUTIANS—INVITATION TO WITNESS MOTION PICTURE

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. President, the Signal Corps has just completed a motion picture entitled "Report From the Aleutians." It is in technicolor, and runs for 42 minutes.

On the surface, Report from the Aleutians is the intimate, factual story of our men and their fight to establish attack bases along the finger of islands pointing to the heart of our enemy, Japan.

Actually, it is the story of how all services and arms of the American fighting forces—air, sea, and land—have teamed up for victory.

As we well remember, in June of 1942 the Japanese, aiming at our continent, struck at Dutch Harbor and Midway. Reeling back from that attack, the remnants of the foe sought refuge at Kiska and Attu, in the Aleutian chain. Immediately it became necessary for us to establish ourselves within striking distance of that new danger.

The motion picture is the record of how we succeeded, how our fighting forces converted a spongy, barren, storm-ridden island into an attack base, how they built an airfield out of a lagoon, how they transported all their food, munitions, machinery, and men thousands of miles through submarine-infested seas.

Senators will see the actual bombing of Kiska, now a daily mission; they will see a graphic record of the kind of soldier the American man can be.

Tomorrow, Thursday, first at 2 o'clock and again at 3 o'clock, in the caucus room of the Senate Office Building, the Members of Congress are cordially invited to see the motion picture. Of course, members of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate will be expected to attend.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CHANDLER in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Commerce:

Capt. Charles A. Park to be a rear admiral for temporary service in the Coast Guard, to rank from May 1, 1943; and

Don A. Jones and David M. Whipp, to be hydrographic and geodetic engineers with rank of lieutenant (junior grade) in the Coast and Geodetic Survey, from May 15, 1943.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters; and

Wallie E. Beasley, to be postmaster at Biloxi, Miss., in place of J. R. Meunier, retired (adverse report).

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. HILL. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc.

Mr. HILL. I ask that the President be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today by the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the President will be notified forthwith.

That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HILL. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Norman Collison, of Bridgeville, Del., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Delaware, in place of James H. Latchum.

WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION

William J. Cronin, Jr., from the State of Connecticut, to be area director, at \$5,600 per annum, in the New Haven area office.

John R. Kelly, from the State of Indiana, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Muncie area office.

Joseph H. Braunagel, from the State of Illinois, to be area director, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Peoria area office.

Edward D. Connor, from the State of Indiana, to be area chief of training, at \$4,600 per annum in the Chicago area office.

Arthur C. Gernes, from the State of Massachusetts, to be deputy regional director, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Boston regional office.

George C. Estill, from the State of Florida, to be regional chief of manpower utilization, at \$6,500 per annum, in the Atlanta regional office.

Donald H. Roney, from the State of California, to be senior labor market analyst, at \$4,600 per annum, in the San Francisco regional office.

Julian Capers, Jr., from the State of Texas, to be senior information specialist, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Dallas regional office.

Edwin E. Knott, from the State of Missouri, to be senior manpower utilization consultant, at \$4,600 per annum, in the Washington area office.

APPOINTMENTS, BY TRANSFER, IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

TO ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT

Maj. George Walter Vaughn, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 12, 1941.

Capt. Elmer Matthew Webb, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from June 14, 1937.

TO CAVALRY

Lt. Col. James Brian Edmunds, Quartermaster Corps (temporary colonel), with rank from December 18, 1941.

TO COAST ARTILLERY CORPS

Capt. Jacob George Reynolds, Finance Department (temporary lieutenant colonel), with rank from June 13, 1939.

TO AIR CORPS

First Lt. Henry Crandall Newcomer, Corps of Engineers (temporary major), with rank from June 12, 1942, effective June 30, 1943.

Second Lt. Arvol Duane Allen, Infantry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Harold Reid Armstrong, Jr., Infantry (temporary captain), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. James Moore Boyd, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Lewellyn Clifford Daigle, Infantry (temporary major), with rank from October 5, 1942.

Second Lt. Robert Usher Gaines, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1941.

Second Lt. Ferdinand Frederick Glomb, Jr., Coast Artillery Corps (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. Jay Jaynes, Field Artillery, with rank from May 29, 1942.

Second Lt. Boylston Brooks Lewis, Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from February 20, 1942.

Second Lt. John Raymond Sands, Jr., Infantry (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from June 11, 1941.

Second Lt. Samuel Frederick Stebelton, Corps of Engineers (temporary first lieutenant), with rank from July 1, 1942.

Second Lt. Sam Powell Wagner, Cavalry, with rank from May 29, 1942.

PROMOTIONS IN THE REGULAR ARMY OF THE UNITED STATES

To be colonel with rank from June 12, 1943

Lt. Col. Joseph Logan Arthur, Jr., Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John Stewart Bragdon, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. George Jacob Richards, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Lehman Wellington Miller, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Douglas Lafayette Weart, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

Lt. Col. Earl Ewart Gesler, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. John French Conklin, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

×Lt. Col. William Frazer Tompkins, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Douglas Hamilton Gillette, Corps of Engineers (temporary colonel).

Lt. Col. Donald Angus Davison, Corps of Engineers (temporary brigadier general).

×Lt. Col. Henry Spiese Aurand, Ordnance Department (temporary major general).

PROMOTIONS, FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE, IN THE NAVY

Capt. Gerald F. Bogan, United States Navy, to be a rear admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of December 1942.

Rear Admiral Thomas C. Kinkaid to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to rank from the 7th day of June 1943.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate June 9 (legislative day of May 24), 1943:

POSTMASTERS

KENTUCKY

Howard K. Veach, Carlisle.

Ethel Hibbard, Loyall.

Edward Schindler, Middletown.

Dorothy M. Kent, Morgantown.

Frank W. Mimms, Trenton.

Lovella L. Campbell, Vicco.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 9, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. Dr. Daniel A. Poling, minister of the Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, and president of the World's Christian Endeavor Society, offered the following prayer:

Our Father, we thank Thee that Thou art God of our fathers, God of our country, and our God. Thou hast companioned us through dark days. Thou art the comrade of our lives. We invoke Thy presence. Pour out the spirit of courage, of fortitude, and of faith upon our country. Be with the President of the United States and all who are associated with him in leadership above us and beneath Thee, that we will remember our sons who are on all fronts of the world—on the land, on the sea, and in the air—offering now the last full measure of devotion that freedom shall not perish from the earth.

We do not seek deliverance from responsibilities. We do not ask exemption from sorrow and from sacrifice. We pray for wisdom and for power. May we for those times be adequate as were those in other times for their occasions. We pray Thy blessing upon this institution, upon these Representatives of the American people. We pray that they shall give now not only for ourselves alone but for all men and all women and all little children everywhere the stored resources of the years. Lead on, O King Eternal. May we find a just and lasting peace as we win this war and may we win the peace not only for ourselves and for our sons and daughters but for the children of men through generations that are to

be. Through Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a joint resolution of the House of the following title:

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for food.

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted the following resolution (S. Res. 157):

Resolved, That the Senate has heard with profound sorrow the announcement of the death of Hon. ULYSSES S. GUYER, late a Representative from the State of Kansas.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the President of the Senate to join the committee appointed on the part of the House of Representatives to attend the funeral of the deceased Representative.

Resolved, That the Secretary communicate these resolutions to the House of Representatives and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect to the memory of the deceased the Senate do now take a recess until 12 o'clock meridian tomorrow.

The message also announced that pursuant to the provisions of the above resolution the Presiding Officer had appointed Mr. CAPPER and Mr. REED members of said committee on the part of the Senate.

POSTAL RATES ON FIRST-CLASS MATTER

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to an agreement with the Speaker, and the majority and the minority leaders and the ranking Members on both sides of the Ways and Means Committee, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of House Joint Resolution 134, to continue the temporary increase in postal rates on first-class matter, and for other purposes, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 1001 (a), as amended (relating to temporary increase in first-class postage rate), of the Revenue Act of 1932, and section 2, as amended (authorizing the President to modify certain postage rates), of the act entitled "An act to extend the gasoline tax for one year, to modify postage rates on mail matter, and for other purposes," approved June 16, 1933, are further amended by striking out "July 1, 1943" wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "July 1, 1945", and by striking out "June 30, 1943," wherever appearing therein and inserting in lieu thereof "June 30, 1945".

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object, just long enough for the distinguished gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COOPER] to explain the purpose of the bill.

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman from Ohio will recall, this resolution was unanimously reported by the Committee on Ways and Means. It

simply extends for the present the 3-cent postal rate for another 2 years.

Mr. JENKINS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my reservation of objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. How much money will this bring in?

Mr. COOPER. The report of the Post Office Department is that the estimated revenues yield, due to the additional 1-cent postage on first-class matter, is \$130,000,000 per year. The estimated total yield of first-class mail for 1942 is \$492,885,000. The estimated total yield of second-class mail for 1942, is \$26,793,000.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it is not my intention to object to the consideration of this proposition, but it seems to me that when several publications in this country that might well be dispensed with at the present time are getting a rake-off of many millions of dollars a year each in their postage reductions, we might at least give some consideration to the individuals in America who have to pay this 3-cent postage—the mothers and fathers who write their sons in the armed services. I understand that the deficit caused by these publications amounts to around \$100,000,000 a year, almost as much as they now ask to take from the masses of the American people who write individual letters. If we are going to continue this policy, I submit that both these matters should be brought before the House and be given consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the joint resolution?

There was no objection.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read a third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

CONSTRUCTION OF LIBERTY SHIPS

Mr. BLAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. BLAND addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in two particulars, and in one to include a letter written by the Chief of Staff, General Marshall, to a constituent of mine, and my constituent's reply.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CELLER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including an address I made over the Columbia Broadcasting System last night on the subject of rolling back prices.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WEISS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include an address by William T. Kerr.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a speech I delivered last night over WHN.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

BROOKLYN SUNDAY SCHOOL UNION

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, in Brooklyn tomorrow, June 10, there will be celebrated the one hundred and fourteenth anniversary day parade of the Brooklyn Sunday School Union. I have on previous occasions called this event to the attention of the House, and I feel justified in doing it again because that celebration does not have a counterpart any place in the world. I wish I could describe it to you. One hundred thousand or more men, women, and children participate, proudly marching under the militant banner of godliness. They are on a holiday of holiness. All the public schools are closed and all business is usually suspended. Today, particularly, I think we should look to events like this for what is needed is such lights to shine not only when the world is bright and at peace, but particularly when the world is dark and dreary and at war. There has been written for me an original poem commemorating the day, and it is as follows:

One hundred and fourteen years record
This Anniversary Day Parade
As proud we march to praise the Lord,
With stirring floats and flags displayed.
We and our children here have trod
In Brooklyn's day of holiness
To honor Brooklyn, Church and God
Whose love and grace our people bless.
This year's parade is doubly dear
For Brooklyn's bravest far away.
Our heroes who cannot march here—
Remember them this holy day.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mrs. LUCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD and include therein an editorial from Contemporary China, a reference digest, on the subject of the antiexclusion law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a poem written by a disabled soldier.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRESENTATION OF AMBULANCE BY CAPITOL EMPLOYEES

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow at 11:45 a. m., on the east plaza of the Capitol, the Capitol employees will present to the Government of the United

States an ambulance for use by the United States Army. The Capitol employees raised more than \$2,000 from their campaign for funds sponsored by the Congressional Secretaries Club, composed of secretaries to Members of Congress, in order to provide the money to purchase this ambulance. The ambulance completely equipped will cost \$1,539. The Capitol Hill employees exhibit an example of loyalty and generosity that might well be emulated by many other groups in this country. It stands as a most commendable and constructive act.

The ambulance will be accepted by Brig. Gen. Wilton B. Persons, Edward W. Smith, and Maj. Gen. Norman T. Kirk, newly appointed Surgeon General of the United States Army, in behalf of the United States. We are all invited to stop by the east steps of the Capitol tomorrow and witness the presentation ceremony.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a Memorial Day address by the Rev. Arnold Brink, of Muskegon, Mich.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD, and include a brief editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

NATIONAL FARM PROGRAM

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute, and to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. VOORHIS of California addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

PACIFIC NORTHWEST REGIONAL OFFICE OF WAR MANPOWER COMMISSION AND WAR PRODUCTION BOARD

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

[Mr. COFFEE addressed the House. His remarks appear in the Appendix.]

DISPOSITION OF SURPLUS GOVERNMENT PROPERTY

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 248, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appur-

tenant thereto, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HALLECK].

This resolution makes in order consideration of a bill dealing with the disposition of surplus property owned by the Government of the United States. It has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. The discussion of the bill before the Rules Committee indicated that there is not much opposition. I have no disposition to consume time on the rule, and as soon as the gentleman on the minority side consumes such time as he may desire, I think we can adopt the rule and proceed with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 20 minutes to the ranking minority member of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, from which this resolution comes, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, there seem to have been several requests for time, therefore I will proceed under the rule.

You may feel that this is not an important matter. It is of importance to me because of the fact that we are making almost our initial bow before the Congress. The Committee on Expenditures is actually reporting a bill today.

I felt that I ought to revive your memory as to the powers and duties of the Committee on Expenditures. That committee was heralded as one of the most useful in the House. After my many years of service I was made the ranking minority member, or the chairmanship in the event of Republican control. I was made to feel that it would be a very important assignment.

We soon learned that no administration would probably ever allow much of an investigation of its own activities, and I have sometimes feared that if I became chairman of the committee under a Republican regime my own leadership might try to suppress any activity in investigating things happening under the Republican rule.

I have considered that question many times, and wondered what my response might be. However, I read something this morning that interested me much. It seems Wendell Phillips once said that when a statesman, so-called, arrives at 70 and when he no longer has any hope of being President, you can get the truth out of him. I qualify, partially at least.

As to the importance of this committee I will revive your memory regarding

its supposed powers and duties. The examination of accounts and expenditures of the several departments, independent establishments, and commissions of the Government, and the manner of keeping those accounts; the economy, justness, and correction of such expenditures; their conformity with appropriation laws; the proper application of public moneys; the security of the Government against unjust and extravagant demands; retrenchment; the enforcement of the payment of moneys due to the United States; the economy and accountability of public officers; the abolishment of useless offices, shall all be subjects within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

This seems to cover many highly important activities and most-exacting duties.

It has been held that the committee may make investigations without specific direction from the House, unless it decides to compel testimony.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. Would you say, after that description of the territory that this committee is supposed to cover, and from action we have had from the committee during at least the last 6 years, that the committee and its functions and its activities should be described as a hoop-skirt; one that covers everything and touches nothing?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes. But the point I wanted to make is that sometimes I have felt that new Members may have thought I was shirking my duties, but the older Members will remember that for several years in the critical periods of New Deal excesses, I obtained the floor, demanding many investigations. I introduced many orders to investigate departments. I was always confronted with a sort of white-wash from the department, and the leaders would then lay the order on the table and no discussion was in order, under the rule.

I often suffered the weariness of futility, but kept it up for a long time. I frankly confess that since this war has been upon us, I have somewhat lost my urge for investigation, lest it give the appearance of interfering with the war effort. Today we find a different situation. The administration itself wants something, and this committee seems to be the refuge to which they must repair for favorable action. They now want a transfer of authority from the Congress to the Executive in the matter of disposal of property. This right has been carefully guarded by this body. You gentlemen might well study the bill that was first presented.

In the Congress rests the full authority and the duty of the disposal of property. The Executive can only act under authority specially delegated by the Congress. After the war there will be a stupendous amount of such property. It is estimated at not less than \$50,000,000,000. The original bill would have transferred from the Congress to the

Bureau of the Budget, which is a bureau controlled by the Executive, the full authority in the disposal of that property.

The Comptroller came before us and I asked him if he still felt that he was an official representative of the Congress rather than the Executive, and he insistently replied, "The Congress. But the Comptroller General was appointed by the present President." We may well feel that he should be fearless, inasmuch as he is appointed to serve for 15 long years and can only be removed by this body.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point that the House is not in order.

Mr. GIFFORD. I think the House is in very good order. I can see that my Republican friends are listening carefully. This ought to be a joyful day for the members of this committee. I think it is. It is a most satisfactory day to me, for here I am speaking in behalf of a report from this committee, rather than making a protest. I am approving the action of the committee. How different. I am in accord with this bill. But the entire membership has greatly curtailed its original broad and dangerous provisions. I recall the old adage: "He who gives too soon will be soon called upon to give again." We have given but little and we have taken 4 months doing it. We have been careful. We have had prolonged hearings. We have heeded the fears of the Army, the Navy, the Treasury, the R. F. C., and many others. We have tried to protect those agencies from too much meddling in their affairs. If you read the bill carefully you will find that we have not yielded very much authority, but I for one want to be fair enough to acknowledge that certainly there is real necessity for providing for a great deal of surplus, most especially the quantities left over after liquidation of several activities. One illustration ought to be enough. Much property of the W. P. A., estimated at some \$40,000,000, is now deteriorating and should be transferred where needed. Certainly that ought to be disposed of in the proper manner. The Director of the Budget will take control of that surplus property through the Procurement Department of the Treasury, and make proper rules and regulations. The original bill provided for too great a taking from the power of the Congress. We would not delegate the power over \$50,000,000,000. This must be considered later. There is a provision in the bill that a joint committee be appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate to consider the proper method for the disposal of that huge amount of surplus material left after the war is over. Industry and the businessmen of the country may well worry over the disposal of that \$50,000,000,000.

We must be very cautious in its disposition. We do not want a recurrence of the conditions after the First World War, when vehicles of all sorts were sold across the water, at such low prices that they could be bought and reshipped to the United States and sold to our citizens at a large profit. We thought they

would not enter into competition with their own manufacturers, but they did.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. RANDOLPH. I think the membership of the House is rightly concerned over the proper sale of surplus property and commodities. I wonder if the gentleman would agree with me as being genuinely exercised over the tremendous purchase of lands and property by the Federal Government during the period of the war. Is it not also a very serious problem?

Mr. GIFFORD. I might take the time to enlarge on that and to express my own opinion about it. We know so little about it; that is, we have so little factual knowledge. But we feel certain that the military have taken off the market enormous quantities of goods that the civilian population needs and ought to have, simply because they might need it in the future. We hardly dare criticize the military for doing that, unless we can show they have done so. However, I have no doubts about it.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. MILLER of Nebraska. I wonder if the committee has gone into the amount of property in the shape of real estate that the United States Government owns? At a recent meeting in Omaha, Nebr., of county officials, the fact was brought out that the United States Government was the owner of about 375,000,000 acres of land. I think they own about 52 percent of the land in Wyoming.

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes; indeed we have, and we cut all real estate out of this bill.

There is one bone of contention in this bill. I want to say that one of the members of our committee seems very much exercised about it. It is relating to the special joint committee to be appointed. Some of the members do not want to give up the prerogatives of the committee. Many special committees of investigation have been set up, especially by another body. Many members of our committee feel that they are competent to pass on this whole matter of surplus goods disposal.

I have hopes that this bill will amount to something in that there is not now in the law proper authority to dispose of much property now destroyed or wasted. How many letters I have received—you must also have received many—telling of the waste incident to the building of these cantonments. Hundreds of acres of woodlands cleared for them and for airports. People needed that chopped wood—the Army, of course, could not give it away lest they be accused of favoritism. They had no authority to sell that wood so they simply burned it—at great expense to the Government. That sort of thing must be stopped. The military have a proper system of bookkeeping so that they probably know every day exactly what they have on hand. But that is bookkeeping only and the accountants must

accept reports of much property simply accounted for by being marked "condemned." I understand that is a popular and efficient method used to account for disappearance of property which, if authority had been granted, could have been sold, or at least given away.

We find that officers in the Army have too little authority in the matter of disposal of property. It is claimed under this bill that regulations will be formulated to cure this situation. This bill is full of exceptions. The Army, the Navy, the R. F. C., and others seem to be satisfied with it. We should feel safe in voting for it.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. ROWE. If authority is extended to the agency to dispose of this material, has there been cautionary moves made so that no particular line of material will be a drug on the market by loading it up?

Mr. GIFFORD. There would not be enough of that under this bill to disturb the market. We have carefully considered that phase and postponed authority to dispose of the great surplus expected later.

As to the details of this bill, if you can read the King's English it would not be difficult except for the many references in it to the many acts heretofore passed. A copy of the hearing will give you the complete Budget and Accounting Act, and title III, which sets up the Comptroller General and General Accounting Office.

I particularly want to congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. He is a perfect marvel at detail, and I am delighted to support him in this measure. I congratulate him sincerely on his grasp of detail. I might, also, discuss these details. I might feel competent to do it. But I preferred to give you the over-all picture. It is the intent of the legislation that, from the very beginning, interested me, and if you will read the hearings you will find how carefully we looked into that and questioned as to the broad powers we were asked to grant to the executive department.

Before I get through with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], may I say one thing further. I paid the gentleman a high compliment just now and I meant it. I want to remind you of those former days when I was trying to get investigations, when he was like the Rock of Gibraltar in not allowing anything of that sort to be done by the committee. Today is the first time he has come into his own, though not really the chairman. He is acting chairman, the chairman being away, and in matters of detail he will be able to answer any questions you may possibly think of relating to the bill. You know, Mr. WHITTINGTON, "one rooster does not help another rooster by scratching in the same spot." I intend to let you make full explanation of the provisions in the bill.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. I want to join with the gentleman in his praise of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON]. I do want to reserve one objection, however. I know the gentleman from Mississippi will explain every detail of the bill and I know that every Member of the House will be glad to ask questions. There is one thing in which I disagree with the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] and that is in reference to section 4 of this bill. This committee has been diligently acting for 4 months and the committee should continue the job. Therefore, I point out one disagreement only to my fine friend.

Mr. GIFFORD. I may wish to take some time later. As I stated, this bill may be a little difficult to read because of the references. You may wish to know a little about it, but I assure you that the committee has taken 4 months and we have tried to understand it. Sometimes, the less we know the more we suspect. I imagine some of you may possibly suspect a great deal.

The message of the President amused me when it came in last fall. He said that by Executive order he had done much but preferred affirmative authority from the Congress. I should think he would. As an illustration, he hinted that he might like to take from the Government buildings our air-cooling machinery for nongovernmental industries. Somehow or other that did not come to our committee, although he addressed our committee. It was seen fit to send that matter to the so-called Lanham committee. That was one item on which the President perhaps found he ought to go lightly, because Congress might have awakened if he had taken our air-conditioning from us. So he mentioned that he should have affirmative authority from us. I think he was very wise not to have awakened too much curiosity as to what he was really doing under executive authority, alone. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who is such a splendid cross-examiner, would get busy with the Executive himself I think the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] would find a great many things that the Executive would have to explain.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I may say I have tried to protect the Congress in this bill. Later on when the disposal of \$50,000,000 of surplus property comes up for consideration, I think we will have much more to say. However, it has been a pleasure to act on the floor as the ranking minority member of the committee, and to prove to the House that the committee is still really in existence and ready to go under another administration.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HALLECK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] outlined the history of this committee, its program, and the reason for the committee's organization. Frankly, the committee has been a burial ground for practically every bill that has come

before it. It was intended to be a burial ground. It was intended to be the administration's burial ground for measures that were controversial and offensive to it.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENDER. I yield to the gentleman from West Virginia.

Mr. RANDOLPH. The gentleman will recall that it has been the burial ground for proposals which have been made to reorganize our defense establishments, especially the War and Navy Departments, to create one over-all Secretary, with Under Secretaries for the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force. Year after year, or a dozen occasions, I have requested but been denied a hearing on creating a Department of Defense. I congratulate the gentleman from Ohio for trying to give a hearing on that important subject.

Mr. BENDER. Frankly, on almost every occasion, whenever a bill was referred to our committee, we had very little time for consideration, and the bill was killed before it had a chance to be discussed.

I join my friend from Massachusetts in saying that I am utterly amazed to think that finally a bill has come out of the committee and has the committee's approval. I am surprised and pleased to find the Committee on Rules ready to act on this bill. I wish the Committee on Rules was as ready to act on the resolution continuing the Tolan committee, the only committee that has not been renewed by this Congress. The Committee on Rules has been sitting on that resolution, why I do not know. But they did not sit on this bill very long, apparently because all the teeth have been pulled from the bill.

This bill is very different from the bill that was originally presented. It has been completely butchered. The Army came in and objected to its coming under the provisions of this bill, so the Army was taken out. The Navy objected to coming under the provisions of the bill, so the Navy was excluded from its provisions. In fact, every objecting agency was taken out of the bill. So you have here a bill that provides for the disposal of surplus commodities exactly as the administration wants it, displeasing no one, and providing for something that of course is at least an approach to the problem.

This bill is necessary. There is a need for some authority to dispose of surplus commodities. The Army, in purchasing lands for army camps, had hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of agricultural implements on hand at a time when farmers were crying for agricultural implements, but the Army had no way of disposing of them. It had no authority to dispose of them and had to use the device that is commonly used and is known as an Executive order, or directive, in order to dispose of the property.

I am sorry the bill does not carry some of the provisions it carried originally, when it was introduced. Even though the Bureau of the Budget is the right arm of the administration, there are

many men in that bureau who are career men and who are trying to do a fine job. I believe they are conscientious and have an earnest desire to see that the taxpayers get as much money as possible back for all these excesses that have been purchased at any time, particularly during this war period. This bill provides for the disposal of surplus commodities, not including real estate, during wartime, and we shall have more legislation to provide for the disposal of properties after the war is over.

Speaking very frankly and very bluntly, there is no need of kidding ourselves about this bill. This bill is exactly what the administrative members of the committee want. That is why it is going to pass through this Congress like a cat goes through a dog show.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who has just taken his seat complimented the Committee on Rules to some extent for having reported out the rule on this bill, and took occasion to refer to the fact that the Committee on Rules has not reported a resolution on the Tolan committee.

The pending bill provides for an investigation of this subject further by a special committee. In this session of Congress I have supported resolutions authorizing legislative committees, such as that on naval affairs and military affairs, to make investigations as to how the administration of the legislation coming through those committees is being handled. But I have opposed the appointment in this session of Congress of special investigating committees. I think we shall soon have reached the point where we will be confronted with the necessity of appointing a special committee to investigate the special investigating committees. This Tolan committee, for instance—

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order, first, that the House is not in order; and, second, since we are listening to a very fine speech on the main point of this bill, that a quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. I hope the gentleman will not do that.

Mr. CHURCH. I am very anxious that the gentleman be heard by the Members of the House.

Mr. CLARK. I would prefer to yield the floor than have the gentleman insist on the point of order.

Mr. CHURCH. I realize that, but in a few minutes we go from the House into the Committee of the Whole, and we have present only a few Members.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman desire to take the gentleman from North Carolina off his feet by a point of no quorum?

Mr. CHURCH. I desire to make the point of order that a quorum is not present in order that the gentleman may be heard by more than just a handful of Members.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has already made the point of order that a quorum is not present, and he cannot make a speech now.

Evidently a quorum is not present.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 95]

Baldwin, Md.	Gavagan	O'Brien, N. Y.
Baldwin, N. Y.	Gibson	O'Konski
Barry	Gillie	O'Leary
Bell	Grant, Ala.	O'Toole
Boykin	Hart	Pfeifer
Bradley, Mich.	Hartley	Philbin
Buckley	Heffernan	Pracht
Bulwinkle	Hendricks	Rees, Kans.
Burdick	Hinshaw	Rivers
Camp	Hollfield	Rizley
Cannon, Fla.	Hope	Robinson, Utah.
Cannon, Mo.	Izac	Russell
Capozzoli	Johnson, Okla.	Sabath
Carter	Kelley	Satterfield
Chenoweth	Kennedy	Schwabe
Cochran	King	Scott
Cole, Mo.	Kirwan	Sheridan
Colmer	Lea	Simpson, Pa.
Costello	LeCompte	Smith, W. Va.
Crawford	LeFevre	Stanley
Culkin	Lemke	Stegall
Cullen	Lynch	Taber
Cunningham	McGehee	Taylor
Dawson	McMurray	Thomas, N. J.
Dies	Magnuson	Tolan
Dirksen	Mansfield	Treadway
Domeneaux	Mont	Van Zandt
Doughton	Marcantonio	Vinson, Ga.
Douglas	Merrrow	Voorhis, Calif.
Drewry	Monkiewicz	Wadsworth
Eaton	Morrison, N. C.	Weaver
Eberharter	Mundt	Welch, Ohio
Fitzpatrick	Murphy	Welch, Ga.
Fogarty	Myers	Wolfenden, Pa.
Fulmer	Newsome	Woodrum, Va.
Furlong	Nichols	
Gallagher	Norton	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and twenty-three Members have answered to their names, a quorum. Without objection further proceedings under the call will be dispensed with.

There was no objection.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, at the time the point of no quorum was made, I was on the verge of moving the previous question on the pending resolution. My distinguished friend, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], said he made the point of order because he thought I was making a good statement, which the membership ought to hear. Of course, I appreciate that compliment, but I think the situation is rather that he was so startled by the fact that I was undertaking to say anything on the floor for more than 1 minute that he was shocked into making the point of order of no quorum. Perhaps it would be right for me to say since more of the membership are on the floor, that the pending resolution would make in order the consideration of a bill for the disposition of surplus personal Government property, and to set up a committee to investigate the perplexing question of just how we shall dispose later on of the vast amount of real estate owned by the Government in this country and abroad. In that connection the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] mentioned the fact that the Rules Committee, while promptly reporting the rule on this bill, had declined so far to report a rule continuing the Tolan special investigating committee, whereupon I was moved to say that, while I approved the practice of having investigating committees of various subjects by the various legislative committees of the House, I did not approve the practice which has become so prolific, of appointing special committees to investigate this, that, and the other subject, and that in my judgment we soon will have reached the point where we will have to set up a special

investigating committee to investigate these special investigating committees.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Not at this moment. We have given the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the Military Affairs Committee authority to investigate subjects in the line of their jurisdiction, and lately we have conferred such authority upon the Agricultural Committee with reference to the Farm Security Administration, which is all right, but it will be rare instances in which a situation will arise where an investigation should not more properly be made by some legislative committee of the House. With all due respect to the Tolan committee, we all know that it was appointed to investigate the subject of migratory labor, resulting after the storm in the Dust Bowl, and all that. If you will read the last report of that committee, you will find that it has completely left that subject, and it files a report in which it almost takes over the whole war effort. We appointed the Dies committee to investigate subversive activities, and un-Americanism, and so forth, and about the only activity I have been able to notice about that committee lately is that a subcommittee of the Dies committee is now in California investigating the internment of Japanese in California, and I am unable to conceive how that special committee could think it has jurisdiction to go out and deal with a question so loaded with dynamite as that question is. I am simply making the suggestion to the House that I think it is about time we put the brakes on the appointment of some of these special committees to investigate these various questions. I now yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the force of the gentleman's remarks but I am inclined to think that this measure may lead to a great deal of confusion if adopted. I notice, for instance, in defining the term "property" it says it does not include any land, building, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures, or any gold or silver. Then on page 17 it provides under subsection (b) of section 4 for full and complete study and investigation of tangible property, both real and personal. Certainly it seems to me that the committees which have charge of matters of this character ought to be able to determine that, and I am afraid that we will have confusion worse confounded unless this bill can be explained in such a way that it will lay aside the objections that seem apparent on the face of it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Just to say to the gentleman from Texas that the committee authorized will not deprive any legislative committee of its jurisdiction. The purpose of this committee is to make recommendations to Congress, and those recommendations would be referred to the proper committees.

Mr. LANHAM. I am not opposing that feature of this bill, because we will have at the close of the war a vast

amount of real estate in this country and in other countries. I happen to be chairman of the committee having to do with war housing, and a great deal of land has been acquired. We make our investigations and are authorized to do so and it seems to me that we are in a better position to know about that situation than any independent committee investigating the matter, or that it could possibly know.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. BENDER. I respect the gentleman's opinion, and his attitude toward special committees, but the gentleman will agree that many special committees have been created during this Congress, as for example the Dies committee, the Smith committee, the Cox committee, the Committee on Small Business, the Committee on Wildlife, the Canners committee, the Committee on Newsprint, and the Kerr committee. The Select Committee on Defense Migration has come before the Rules Committee only after receiving the favorable opinion of the Speaker of the House and the majority and minority leaders on the desirability of continuing the work of the committee for a year.

The committee proposes, if continued, to begin at once hearings on farm manpower and migration, so as to report immediately to Congress. This has been the committee's practice throughout its existence: Under House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress, passed March 1941, reports were issued at least every 3 months. That resolution called on the committee to concentrate its attention on problems arising from the migration of workers to war jobs, and that we have done.

The committee's present proposal is to focus its primary attention on the problems of agricultural labor supply, with which it was concerned under House Resolution 63, Seventy-sixth Congress.

In support of the request for continuation the committee would urge its demonstrated ability to take a comprehensive view of a problem and to make vigorous recommendations for correcting existing confusion. Any reader of the press or Washington reporter knows that the committee's reports on industrial manpower are largely responsible for the proposals now being urged upon the President for a national manpower policy. We believe we can do as much for the farm manpower problem.

In response to the question, "What does the committee propose to do about it?" we refer the Rules Committee to the following excerpt from pages 15 and 16 of our final report under House Resolution 113, Seventy-seventh Congress, where we said:

In the estimation of the committee the shortcomings of these programs to date closely parallel those of the industrial manpower programs.

There has been the same failure to recognize the need for great expansion of war production and curtailment of nonessential civilian goods. There has been the same easy optimism about the use of customary methods of handling labor supply. And with respect to the draft, the absence of adequate

occupational deferment machinery has struck agriculture even more heavily than industry. In agriculture, moreover, the need for a close correlation between the utilization of available manpower and other productive facilities is even greater than in industry. This country should long since have related agricultural manpower and production to the work of individual county war boards and local draft deferment boards.

The above quotation will indicate the line we think any legislation should follow. We cannot afford to have agricultural goals calling for more milk or more peanuts, and no coordination between the manpower program and the agricultural program.

To permit the committee to keep up with the problems of war-induced industrial migration, which is draining agriculture of its labor supply, House Resolution 36—Seventy-eighth Congress—continues in force the authority granted under House Resolution 63—Seventy-sixth Congress—and House Resolution 113—Seventy-seventh Congress. No extension of the mandate previously granted the committee is requested.

Support for the work of the committee from the press and public comes from papers throughout the country, including the Detroit Free Press, the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, the Louisville Courier-Journal, the Catholic journals—America, the Sign, and the Commonweal—the Protestant Home Missions Council, the National Travelers Aid, many columnists and commentators, including Raymond Clapper and Baukhage, organized labor including the A. F. of L., C. I. O., and railway brotherhoods. Libraries of schools and colleges throughout the country have made extensive demands for the committee's hearings and reports. Large numbers of Federal, State, and local officials have written indicating their reliance on the proposals of the committee. Witnesses have universally praised the committee for the courteous way they have been received. In 2½ years of work the committee has never used a subpoena.

Mr. CLARK. I appreciate the force of the gentleman's statement. I have no disposition to discriminate, as far as I am concerned, against the Tolan committee. I voted against the appointment of all of these special committees. The complaint I have against them is that if you will compare their final reports with the resolution by which they were authorized you will see that in 9 cases out of 10 they have wholly departed from the jurisdiction that was originally conferred upon them. I have seldom seen any concrete results from the appointment of these special committees, except in very extraordinary cases.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. With reference to the statement made by the gentleman from North Carolina about the subcommittee of the Special Committee to Investigate Un-American and Subversive Activities on the West Coast, I wish to state that that subcommittee was sent there by the chairman to in-

vestigate charges that had been placed with him by Members of this House and the Senate and by reputable people throughout the country that subversive aliens or people born in America of Japanese descent had been released, who were members of subversive organizations and were dangerous people and should be investigated. That is the sole purpose of the committee in going out there.

Mr. CLARK. My only point about that is that it occurred to me when I read the dispatch in the press that that committee was dealing with a very touchy subject that probably belonged with the military or State departments.

Mr. MOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. MOTT. I think that is part of the reason why this committee undertook that investigation, because it is not within the direct jurisdiction of the War Department but the War Relocation Commission. I will say to the gentleman that in my opinion, having lived on the Pacific coast many years, where the Japanese abound, that if what this subcommittee said about the release of the Japanese in their last report is true, this situation should be investigated by some committee, and that committee should report to Congress so that the Congress could take proper action.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. CASE. Can the gentleman state what happens to the funds that will be realized from the sale of surplus properties under the bill which this resolution proposes to make in order?

Mr. CLARK. I prefer that that question should be answered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who will have charge of the bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will say that the bill contemplates a vast improvement upon the existing policy, and unless it involves reimbursable funds or special funds, it provides that those funds shall be covered into the general Treasury of the United States.

Mr. CASE. The point that disturbed me, if I may say to the gentleman, is that on page 10 of the bill there is a sentence which indicates that the proceeds could be credited back to the appropriation of the agency or department interested, and thereby augment the funds of that administrative agency or unit, and the funds would not be in the control of the Congress.

Mr. FORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. I yield.

Mr. FORD. In view of the statement of the gentleman with reference to a special committee to investigate investigating committees, I wonder if Judge SMITH's committee, which is supposed to be investigating whether executive departments are going outside of their jurisdiction, would investigate some of these other committees that you and I think are going beyond their jurisdiction?

Mr. CLARK. I do not know that I could add anything to the gentleman's knowledge along that line.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend the remarks I shall make in Committee of the Whole and include certain computations made by myself and certain records of February 3, 1942, with reference to the soldier's residence.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

AMENDING THE BUDGET AND ACCOUNTING ACT OF 1921

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 2795, with Mr. BONNER in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

By unanimous consent, the first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, at the risk of repeating a statement that is often made when legislation is being considered, I venture to say that there are few matters of more importance to the people and to the Congress than those embraced in the bill now under consideration. Under the Constitution the Congress is vested with the control of the purse and property of the people of the United States.

The bill under consideration is an amendment to the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921. The passage of that act, under a Republican administration, in June 1921 was a great step forward in executive administration. That act provided for the Bureau of the Budget, the financial management arm of the Chief Executive. It provided for the General Accounting Office, often and properly called the arm of the Congress. The bill under consideration does not change or modify or amend the Budget and Accounting Act with respect to the powers of the Director of the Budget or of the Comptroller General. Their powers remain. The amendments are additions to implement and specify more exactly what the committee conceives to be the purposes that Congress really had in mind in the establishment of the Budget and General Accounting Offices, and to utilize the experience of the Government over the past 20 years

in implementing the purposes of that act.

Congress can control the purse strings of the Nation in making appropriations; as long as the appropriation remains in the form of money it is subject to the control of Congress, but when the appropriation is converted into services and the purchase of equipment, materials, and supplies, other problems arise.

To get rid, for instance, of the services of Federal employees no longer needed, recently the Director of the Budget has been directed to canvass the situation and to provide for the elimination of employees wherever possible. But unfortunately the Congress has not provided adequately for the efficient management of property in the hands of executive agencies, or for the disposition of the surplus property belonging to the Government and accruing inevitably from its operations. Those properties are being increased day by day. The surpluses are piling up.

Equipment, materials, and supplies and other property may be considered generally under three heads—to wit, procurement, utilization, and disposal of surplus. First, as to the procurement agency of the Government: The Director of Procurement is nothing more nor less, generally speaking, than the purchasing agent under legislation that the Congress has passed. In the various departments rests the determination of the properties that they need, and he has no veto power; his authority is merely to purchase the property. There is not any over-all requirement or standard of management with respect to the utilization of property once that property has been acquired.

I have referred to the procurement of property and its utilization, I come now to the disposition of the property.

Mr. McGRANERY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to complete my explanation, and then I will be glad to yield to any Member?

The first essential requisite of proper management and utilization of property is for the Government to require inventories, provide for standards, to provide for the transfer of that property from one agency to another, to provide for full utilization of property already on hand if a new agency is established, which needs equipment or material, or if material has been acquired by one department of the Government and it has served its purpose, then it should be made available to another department of the Government requiring such property. So the question of utilization is an important one. In the matter of disposition of surplus, after its existence has been ascertained by proper investigation, the law is wholly inadequate.

Mr. ZIMMERMAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question at that point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman allow me to complete my statement? I want to make a connected statement if I can.

Inevitably the surpluses pile up. They piled up during the First World War. With no legislation to provide for their disposition, President Wilson issued an Executive order. The order was amended by the Congress to apply only to the First World War. There were great losses to the Treasury resulting from the utterly inadequate provisions for the disposition of property following the First World War.

Congress undertook to provide, first in 1928 and later in 1933, that property might be transferred between Government agencies at the market value. Appropriations were made upon the request of the Bureau of the Budget to enable departments to acquire property. They acquired property. In many cases hundreds of thousands and millions of dollars' worth of properties were transferred to Government agencies following the First World War, and there was no accounting of the acquisition of the property and no charge against or offsetting reduction of appropriations, since the Congress never had, in the first instance, required such action, and consequently many congressional appropriations were tremendously augmented without the knowledge or consent of Congress. The provisions under existing law are utterly inadequate. There is no legislation requiring the agency that buys new equipment to secure a certificate that some other agency does not have the equipment and belonging to the Government. The present law does not make any provision for determining the surpluses not needed by the purchasing agencies.

There are other defects in the law, and with the discontinuance of the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Work Projects Administration, and numerous other changes in our executive establishment, this problem of surplus property has become acute.

The President of the United States, in November of last year, sent a message to the Congress to advise them that he had established by Executive order for the disposition of surplus property as well as it could be done by Executive order, and recommended the enactment of legislation to provide for the handling of surplus property.

I am very grateful to my colleagues of the committee for their kind personal remarks. May I add that the bill as introduced first in December 1942 and then in the present Congress was H. R. 1610, which was considered by the committee for several months. The bill under consideration, H. R. 2795, is a substitute for the bill H. R. 1610.

This is not a partisan question. As a member of that committee I was assisted by the views and recommendations of all the members of the committee, and they were very diligent in attending the hearings, and particularly the members of the minority. I recall that the ranking member, the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], was insistent that there should be no power vested in the Executive or any other agency that would authorize the disposition of property essential to the prosecution of

the war. The committee included that in the pending bill.

I recall again that the distinguished gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] made a recommendation that there should not be a disposition of the gold and silver located at Fort Knox and West Point. That provision is contained in this bill.

I recall that other members of the committee made recommendations, particularly members from the minority side, that were utilized in the preparation and formulation of this bill. If there ever was, in my experience as a Member of this body, a bill reported that was a committee bill, it is the bill under consideration, because it undertakes to embrace the helpful suggestions which were submitted by all the members of the committee, including the gentleman named, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN], and numerous other members of the committee.

The Executive orders are set out fully and completely in the report.

There is a very clear analysis of this bill in the report of the committee. There is embraced in the report a copy of the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921, the existing law; and let me say before I yield for questions that I think a rather hasty but I trust a fairly accurate analysis of the provisions of this bill will be of benefit to the Members.

In the first place, as it is stated, it amends by inserting a new title in the Budget and Accounting Act without changing the subject matter of that act. Section 251 contains definitions. Property, in this bill means supplies, materials, equipment, and any tangible property owned by the United States, but does not include land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities. The bill H. R. 1610, which was introduced and referred to this committee and providing for the disposition of personal property, did include land, buildings, and appurtenances.

I recall very definitely the suggestion of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and I recall that it was brought to the attention of this committee that the Committee on Buildings and Grounds undertook to handle that problem of the disposition of lands, buildings, and their appurtenant facilities and fixtures, some facilities having been included in the so-called Lanham bill—and I shall have something to say about that bill a bit later. It was passed in this House, but still reposes in the other body. That bill made available essential war materials, as we understood when the bill passed here. The definitions in this bill relate to tangible personal property with the exceptions named. According to the definitions of this bill, "surplus property" means any property which, pursuant to this title, is determined to be surplus to the function, activity, or project in connection with which it was acquired or accrued. I might refer to other definitions, but they are in section 251 of the bill and copies are available.

Section 252 undertakes to implement the purposes of the Budget and Accounting Act. I do not believe I overstate the case when I say that the pending bill is the most progressive advance that

has been made in executive administration in the past 20 years; so, section 252, the second numbered section of the bill, provides that the Director of the Budget shall require inventories, estimates, and annual reports as to the transfers, disposition, or disposal of proceeds. The section provides that the Director shall make a periodic survey to ascertain what surpluses exist and to provide for standards of stocking and use, and require the fullest possible utilization of any surplus property by any agency in order to avoid unnecessary commercial purchases. The section requires the Director to submit to Congress at the close of each fiscal year a report.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. Chairman, the next section 253 provides that there shall be no disposition of surplus property except as provided. That means that there has got to be, if it is transferred to any agency, an accounting. That means that if Congress appropriates money for a certain purpose and the purpose can be promoted by the transfer of property already acquired, that course shall be pursued and the receiving appropriation will pay the fair value into the Treasury, and thus the intent of Congress shall be carried out.

Section 254 undertakes to maintain this integrity of our appropriations. I have in mind an instance where Congress appropriated \$5,000,000 for hurricane relief in New England following the hurricane and flood of 4 or 5 years ago. Two million dollars' worth of property was acquired by the Federal Government, but there was no statute on the books providing for the disposition of that property. There is such a statute in force in the District of Columbia. Section 254 of this bill attempts to do throughout the country what the District of Columbia statute does within the District in the handling of surplus property.

Section 255 provides for disposition of scrap, unusable property.

Section 256 provides a mandate to the head of every agency to determine and make available all surplus property, and directs the President to take such action in the event of inaction by the possessing agency. It further provides for reconditioning of property as found to be necessary and economical.

Section 257 provides that when property has been ascertained to be not needed by any Government department or governmental agency it shall be disposed of by sale or by lease in the domestic market, by sale or by lease to foreign governments, and if it happens to be in a foreign land, if it cannot be sold first to the Government then it may be offered in the commercial market of that country. For instance in Mexico it would first be offered to the Government and if the Government did not want it then it might be offered to the nationals of Mexico. Or, it may be disposed of to tax-supported institutions, per rules and regulations that are authorized, and may be prescribed by the President.

Section 258 relates to accounting with respect to the property, and, as stated in response to the inquiry of the gentleman from South Dakota, the proceeds are to be covered into the Treasury, except in the case of a reimbursable appropriation or corporate fund, so that the Congress can really get its fingers on the fiscal affairs of the agencies of the Government.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

There is a provision that was recommended by the Quartermaster General in section 258 relating to cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman that he knows his subject thoroughly. Why does he insist on telling all about it before he yields to a question at any particular point? I see men who asked the gentleman to yield leaving the Chamber.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be glad to answer any and all inquiries.

Mr. GIFFORD. Why does not the gentleman yield to these questions?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to, but I shall probably anticipate many questions.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman talks on the subject while Members leave the floor after he declined to yield. I think the gentleman should yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I shall be delighted to yield. The gentleman has my permission to ask questions, but I will soon have completed my general explanation and feel sure that I am anticipating many of the questions.

With respect to the question asked by the gentleman from South Dakota, there are provisions in the bill that would authorize the rental of property referred to by him. Section 259, on pages 9 and 10, would undertake to extend to the other governmental agencies the privileges now accruing to the forest and road services. That is the matter that the gentleman referred to in his question, as I understand it, appearing on page 10.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. My question was based on the final sentence of that section, which ends on page 10, and provides that the proceeds from rentals shall be made available to the renter agency for the operation, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the equipment, and that in the absence of such an appropriation it will go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. My question is based on the assumption that in some cases where the Government has a great deal of road-building machinery that will not happen.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, that is the purpose of the bill, to provide for payment into the general funds of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. This is the point: In some cases the money received from that

rental will conceivably exceed the amount that is ever necessary for repair. There is no provision that that shall go into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts but will pile up; that is, whatever is received from the rental and repair fund.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I may say that the purpose of the section is to cover into the General Treasury all proceeds from such rentals which are not needed for operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation and management of the equipment rented, as I have already observed.

Mr. CASE. The language does not do that. It is only in the absence of a repair fund, but if there is a repair fund the repair fund will pile up end without end.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, but if it exceeds the needs set forth in lines 7 and 8 and which I have mentioned a moment ago, my thought is that the purpose of the committee was to undertake to require that that money should not remain in the hands of the department but should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. CASE. But the language of the bill does not say that.

Mr. GIFFORD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. I have tried to assure the gentleman that at least the Bureau of the Budget would know that the money was there when the time came to appropriate more money. I think what the gentleman from South Dakota wants to know is this: Does the gentleman think it advisable to have this bill amended just to add that that money shall be covered in the Treasury when the amount exceeds the amount needed for repair? I think the language here sufficient.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I think that to whatever extent it exceeds the amount required for the purposes stated it should be covered into the Treasury and, as the gentleman from Massachusetts stated, this language was submitted to the Director of the Budget, to the Director of Procurement, and to the General Accounting Office with the specific instruction by members of the committee that generally, unless there was a specific fund where this money is required by law to be deposited, the proceeds should be covered into the general fund of the Treasury.

Mr. DINGELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DINGELL. I would like to interpose an observation and then ask a pertinent question. I consider this bill one of extreme importance now, during the war and immediately after the war when it will be even more important. Following the last war, is it not true that hundreds of millions of dollars of surplus materials and goods were disposed of recklessly with great loss to this Government, in some instances virtually given away, with scarcely no accounting, to brokers, fly-by-night purchasing cor-

porations, and in some instances to racketeers, who then disposed of it to the public at high prices?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is substantially correct. The subject is covered in the report of the committee on the provisions of the bill. I propose to discuss war materials and war surpluses before I conclude my remarks.

Mr. DINGELL. Does the bill specifically provide against some of the violations of good practices of the Government in the disposition of surplus goods? Is that covered in this bill?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is as far as property is authorized to be disposed of, and I will come to the war materials in a few minutes.

Mr. DINGELL. I want to be definitely sure of that.

Mr. LANHAM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. The gentleman from Mississippi has stated that this legislation has nothing to do with real property, yet on page 17, subsection (b) of section 4, referring to the committee investigation, states that its investigation shall include both real and personal property. With reference to the act that emanated from the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the law itself provides the manner in which that property shall be disposed of. Furthermore, it seems to me with reference to much of this personal property that is in these various military and naval establishments secrecy must be maintained not only with reference to the location of it, but with reference to the purpose of its being there, and that divulging such information by a committee that goes snooping around would likely interfere with our war effort.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will anticipate the gentleman's question. I think that ample provision has been made to safeguard in both respects and I will cover that when I get to section 2 of the bill. I may say in passing that the land and buildings acquired by the Government were for the prosecution of the war and they cannot be disposed of under the terms of this bill, nor can any property in their possession or control be disposed of without the consent of the War Department, Navy Department, and Maritime Commission as the case may be; moreover, if the report of the special committee makes any recommendations, they will be referred to the proper committees of the House and Senate.

Mr. LANHAM. But the War Department, the Navy Department, and Maritime Commission does not have control of the property under the act to which I refer. I can understand with reference to surplus property such as typewriters, desks, and articles of furniture, things of that kind, that surplus property of that kind could be disposed of through administrative channels.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

Mr. LANHAM. I am afraid of the appointment of a committee to go all over

the country digging into these things which are the responsibility of various legislative committees.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We have your views and we will come to that a little bit later. The special committee would guard all war secrets. It will not travel over the country.

Mr. McGRANERY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. McGRANERY. On that particular point, as I understood the chairman to explain the bill, he said property as defined on page 2 of the bill means any supplies, materials, or equipment or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation, but not including any land or buildings. Then we go over to page 17, under subsection (b) and you say tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes. That is apparently a very glaring contradiction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is in error. The definition on page 2 describes the property that may be disposed of as surplus property. The language "real and personal property" on page 17 describes investigations that are to be made to develop facts that are not now available to the Members of Congress as to the land and buildings owned by the Government, and I will cover that in a moment. There is no provision in the bill for disposing of lands and buildings acquired for war purposes. The special committee will make recommendations to the Senate and House for the disposal of real property.

Mr. McGRANERY. Are not these legislative committees already set up by the Congress with full authority, capacity, and intelligence to do this?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes; when and if they are furnished the facts. They will need all the aid, facts, and recommendations that the special committee could furnish.

Mr. McGRANERY. What is the view of this committee in bringing in a bill asking that a special committee be set up to usurp the very job now being done?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The job is not being done. No committee has recommended the way or manner to do the job of disposing of war materials. I will come to that part of the bill in just a few moments and be glad to cover it then, if I have not answered the gentleman's question already.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. I should like to call to the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi, who is making a very interesting and able statement, the fact that he overlooked section 253 in his explanation of the bill by sections, and I call his particular attention to subsection (b) of section 253:

In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I anticipate the gentleman's question. I intend to say before I conclude that this bill does not authorize the disposal as surplus property of any of the substantive properties acquired by the corporations established for the prosecution of the war, or by any corporation owned or controlled by the Government. The only property belonging to those corporations that can be disposed of as surplus is the property known as administrative property, such as desks, typewriters, and things of that sort. That is one of the reasons this committee recommended the appointment of a committee to study that matter, because the disposition of the surplus war materials could wreck the economy of this Nation. I care not whether it be hotels, I care not whether it be minerals or strategic materials. For that reason, I shall undertake to state a few minutes later that the committee has recommended further study before we dispose of any corporation property and war materials, except property used for administrative purposes.

Mr. STARNES of Alabama. If the gentleman will let me complete the question, because I want to get the legislative intent of the committee—in view of his explanation, then, the committee does not intend that this bill shall apply to machinery and equipment of the T. V. A. for the construction, maintenance, or operation of the power systems or the fertilizer and chemical operations and similar items of the T. V. A. program authorized by the Congress heretofore?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I would say that those properties were evidently acquired for the functioning of that particular agency of the Government and would not be regarded as surplus property. If, however, the T. V. A. has now or at any time equipment, materials, or supplies which are surplus to its needs—by that I mean not essential for the functioning of the T. V. A.—such surplus other than administrative surplus would not be actionable under this bill, inasmuch as Public No. 17, 73d Congress, approved May 18, 1933, creates the T. V. A. as a body corporate and inasmuch as T. V. A. is thus a corporation.

Mr. ROLPH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. ROLPH. I am one of those who believe we should have less government in business. Does the gentleman's committee anticipate that when this surplus merchandise is dumped on the market it will come in competition with the regular, established business houses throughout the United States, and tend to break down their markets?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I answered the question, I think, a few moments ago, when I said unless additional provision was made for the surplus war property it could wreck the economic structure of the Nation. The purpose is to prevent dumping.

Mr. Chairman, with respect to section 260, the next section, I merely say that this section is intended to cover the disposition of property similar to that embraced in the Lanham bill (H. R. 1294).

We passed a bill here and it was said it was necessary for the prosecution of the war, and it went to the Senate and has not passed the Senate as yet.

Section 261 provides that the powers vested in the President may be exercised by a representative named by him.

Section 262 definitely provides that the bill shall not be construed as a modification of the powers of the Comptroller General.

There are about 100 acts now for the disposition of surplus property by various agencies of the Government. The committee was very careful in reporting this bill not to provide that there should be disposed of any property of any kind essential for the prosecution of the war. So, under section 263, there are listed some 16 acts providing for the disposal of property by the War and Navy departments and the other essential war activities of the Government that are exempt from the provisions of this act.

Section 2, page 15, of the bill provides that during the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution may designate, there shall not be disposed of any property acquired by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, or the War Shipping Administration, without the consent of these agencies, because it is presumed that those properties were acquired for the prosecution of the war.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. JENSEN. As the gentleman knows, there is a lot of equipment, trucks, and road equipment, left over from the C. C. C., stored around in warehouses. This material is needed badly in the farming communities and everywhere. It is just sitting around rusting and rotting down.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That is one of the pressing necessities for the passage of this bill.

Mr. JENSEN. Under this bill, when it is passed, will someone have the authority to dispose of this material and get it into use?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely. That is one of the purposes of the bill and a pressing reason for its immediate passage, I repeat.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Under Executive order, at the present time does not the Procurement Division of the Treasury have authority to dispose of this property?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The representative of that Division says that authority is inadequate, that further legislative authority is needed.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. They have been disposing of property at the present time and have been doing it for some time under that order, have they not?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Because of the neglect of Congress to pass legislation for the proper ascertainment and disposi-

tion of the property, it is being handled by Executive order, and the purpose of this bill is to replace and supplant that Executive order.

In section 3 it is provided that after the date on which the President proclaims that the hostilities of the present war have ceased, no war materials, as described, may be disposed of except as may be provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this act.

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In just a moment. With all due deference, I think if I had made my connected statement, I would have anticipated most of the questions that have been asked. It was the view of this committee, when it rewrote the bill H. R. 1610, after 4 months of study, that the bill should provide for the disposition of surplus properties, and that there should be an inhibition against the disposition of any property, acquired for the prosecution of the war, unless it was done as provided by law, and with the consent of the war agencies, but with the cessation of hostilities there may be \$50,000,000,000 in shoes, clothing, airplanes, tanks, trucks, cars, and the disposition of that property should be so handled that it will not wreck the economic structure of the Nation. With the advice that we had, with the lack of information that the committee had as to the amounts and the kinds of war material, with the lack of information our committee had as to the various Government buildings, of various lands that have been acquired, the hotels, and other properties in the prosecution of the war, before the committee was willing to recommend legislation to the Congress for the disposition of war material, of those war properties of every kind and description, involving, as I say, probably billions and tens of billions of dollars, the committee recommended that there should be a further study made of the question of war materials, and that question should cover real and personal property, all of the properties acquired for the prosecution of the war, and that that committee should have substantially the same powers that the so-called Byrd committee has now, to provide an investigator to go into the various departments and agencies of the Government, and ascertain for the committee the surplus properties that might be available after the war. And so, in section 4, the committee recommends that there be appointed a committee of five Members of the House, and five Members of the Senate, to study and accumulate information with respect to the various war properties of this country, and to submit interim reports and a final report to the Congress within 6 months.

It is fair to say that those reports will be referred to the proper committees having jurisdiction—to the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, I think they should go—as to the disposition of public buildings and lands acquired by the Government for war purposes, that are not essential to the continued existence of the Government. The reports would be handled as other reports,

and they would be referred in accordance with the rules of the House. The point is that when the Committee on Expenditures had before it a bill that would have provided for the disposition of real estate, the bill was amended so as to provide for further study before we vested any agency with the disposition of real property. This committee, if appointed by the Speaker of the House and the President of the Senate, would probably be the most important committee to be appointed during this session of Congress. We do not limit its membership to any committee, the Expenditures Committee, the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee, or any other. We want the ablest Members, representing a cross section of views of the Congress, to study that question and report to the Congress with respect to the amounts, kinds, and methods of disposition of the property, to prevent just what the gentleman from Michigan, a few moments ago, said occurred after the First World War. The committee, in order to safeguard the contingent fund of the House, is authorized to expend \$10,000 in the employment of an investigator, full time, something that would not be available to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds or the Expenditures Committee or the Committee on Military Affairs, one-half to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and one-half out of the contingent fund of the House. The report is to be submitted to Congress, so that, following the cessation of the war, disposition of property described and defined in this bill as war materials may be made by the Congress of the United States, after full investigation by a special committee composed of five of the ablest and best qualified men in the two branches of the Congress, who will formulate and report to the House and the Senate appropriate recommendations for legislation.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. JENSEN. The gentleman knows that much lumber has been piled up and burned, usable lumber and I am sorry the committee did not see fit to put in a provision making it a penitentiary offense for any officer in charge of any camp or Government property to give orders to pile up lumber or any other equipment and burn it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am very glad that the gentleman brought that to our attention, and it is probably the fault of the Congress that that very thing has happened, and will happen again unless we pass legislation such as this committee has brought to your consideration, which provides for the disposition of just such lumber and materials that now cannot be disposed of under legislation previously passed. I referred to section 260 previously in my remarks.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes.

Mr. POULSON. Is it not true that in the hearings it was shown that that was the reason why there was destruction of property. It was because we did not have

a suitable method by which it could be disposed of.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman is correct. He was in attendance on all of the hearings, and we profited much by his suggestions.

I would like to say in conclusion, Mr. Chairman, that I will be glad to answer, during the further consideration of the bill, any questions which the Members would like to ask. I feel a delicacy in consuming more of the time allotted to our side, although I have only one request for time.

Mr. ROWE. Will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. ROWE. After the committee of five makes the investigation concerning the dumping of materials back on to the market will that be confirmed by act of legislation within the House?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Absolutely. I stated a few moments ago that this committee would make an exhaustive study, as provided in section 4 of this bill, and submit interim reports. There is nothing to prevent the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds for instance bringing in a bill in a week or six weeks from now on an interim report or without any report at all but the final report shall be submitted to the Congress within the next 6 months. For my part I am unwilling to leave to any individual, be he President, be he Director of the Budget, or Director of Procurement, or the Comptroller General, or any agency, without any checks or balances, the disposition of property that may aggregate \$50,000,000,000. In my judgment, the most constructive feature of this legislation, in addition to providing for permanent better management of equipment and supplies and the disposition of surpluses that have been created, is the provision for a committee to study the question and report to Congress for additional legislation for the disposition of war materials.

I welcome questions but as I have stated, it was my desire to make a connected analysis of the bill before yielding for questions. At the risk of repetition I extend my remarks to analyze and explain the bill by sections and I adopt the language, in analyzing the bill, contained in the report that I submitted in behalf of the committee.

ANALYSIS OF H. R. 2795 BY SECTIONS

The Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, established the Bureau of the Budget and our Federal budgetary system. Since the permanent management controls which H. R. 2795 aims to provide are essentially of budgetary character, the first section of the bill proposes a new title, II-A, amplifying the original legislative charter of the budgetary system.

Section 251 defines the terms used throughout the bill and confines its coverage to the executive branch of the Federal Government exclusive of the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

Section 252 provides for the first time by affirmative legislation applicable throughout the executive branch the operational basis for effective executive management of equipment, materials, and supplies. It requires adequate inventory records as the first essential, periodic surveys of stocks on hand, the development and application of standards to govern both stocking and utilization, and the use of surpluses in the fullest degree possible to avoid unnecessary new purchases in the commercial markets. It centers these controls in the Bureau of the Budget and provides a congressional check of all operations under the title through an annual report from the Director of the Budget.

Section 253 prohibits the disposal of surplus property, as defined in this bill, except as provided in the new legislation and except as to the nonadministrative property of Government corporations. The intent of this exception is to leave these corporations entirely free of any effect by the bill upon their buying, stock-piling, or selling operations, but to apply executive management controls to materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporations for administrative purposes.

Section 254 allows the departments and agencies, and administrative units within such departments and agencies necessary freedom of action in transferring surplus property within their respective jurisdictions. At the same time, and again for the first time in general legislation, the requirement is clearly set forth that the integrity of congressional appropriations must be maintained by payment of the full value of equipment, materials, and supplies transferred to them from surplus stocks.

Section 255 gives the individual agencies necessary operational freedom of action in disposing of equipment, materials, and supplies not necessarily surplus but damaged or worn beyond repair, scrap, salvage, and the incidental products of various field operations carried on by the agency disposing of such property. On the other hand, all such disposal functions are to be subject to Presidential regulations, with a view to uniformity of practice and conformity with sound policy. Property may be disposed of by donation under this section only in the event that it is shown to be unsalable and may be destroyed or otherwise disposed of only if not disposable by sale or donation.

Section 256 (a) provides a mandate to the heads of the executive agencies to release to the Procurement Division all usable or repairable equipment, materials, and supplies in their possession and surplus to the needs of the agency. That such a mandate alone is not enough, however, has been amply demonstrated. Human nature is acquisitive, and Government executives like other men, tend to acquire and hold such property beyond the point of need. Therefore the bill goes further, and directs the President to act in the event of failure to do so at the other levels of executive organization. All such property will be declared to the Procurement Division as

surplus, thus providing a focal point of knowledge as to what is available and where.

Section 256 (b) after providing for repair, rehabilitation, and storage, if and as necessary, prescribes the general plan for the transfer of surpluses within the executive branch. Section 256 (b) thus gives first priority to needs within the Federal Government in the disposal of surplus property.

Section 156 (c) gives second priority in disposal of surpluses, to sale or lease to tax-supported organizations of the States, Territories, and other local political subdivisions of the United States. Both the transfers among the Federal agencies and the sales or leases to non-Federal governmental units would be subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe and would be made at values fixed by the Procurement Division.

Section 57 (a) provides for the disposal by sale or lease in the domestic market, to agencies of foreign governments, or in open foreign markets of surplus property not needed by any Federal agency or other tax-supported organization within the United States. Sales or leases in open foreign markets cannot be made unless the property cannot be practically disposed of through foreign governments. Donation of surplus property to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions and finally disposal by destruction or other method is provided for in cases where the property cannot practically be disposed of by sale or lease through any of the channels previously mentioned.

Section 257 (b) requires that sale, lease, donation, destruction, and any other disposition shall be subject to regulations prescribed by the President. It prescribes further that such regulations as to sale or lease shall include provision for publication of the times, places, quantities, terms, and condition of the proposed dispositions of such property, and require advertising for competitive bids except as the President determines that competitive sales or leases would be contrary to the public interest.

Section 258 provides that all proceeds from the transfer, sale, lease, or other disposition of surplus property acquired by the use of funds appropriated from the general funds of the Treasury, and not by law reimbursable, shall be returned to the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. The lack of clear legislation requiring that agencies receiving transferred surplus property pay for same from their available appropriations, and that such payments be returned to the Treasury, has unquestionably resulted in expenditure of many millions of dollars which need not have been expended, or at least were not authorized by Congress. The requirements of this section will in no way hamper any authorized Government activity, and will yield very large returns to the Treasury. The section as written carefully protects reimbursable funds and the capital funds of corporations against impairment.

Experience has shown that the over-all attainment of maximum production

through the most efficient utilization of a minimum of facilities and material requires frequent and repeated intercompany and intracompany transfers of such facilities and materials from the work under cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts to do work under fixed-price contract and subcontract, and that prompt disposition be made of scrap, which is created in the course of such work and directed by the contracting officer. In furtherance of such ends and pursuant to advice of the Judge Advocate General, a contract clause is being inserted in cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contracts which authorizes such transfers when directed by the contracting officer, and provides that the proceeds thereof shall be applied in reduction of the cost of the work under the contract. The final sentence of section 258 is inserted to preserve the validity of such clauses insofar as they might be affected by the provisions of this section.

Section 259 is designed to promote more efficient use of Government-owned equipment and in the judgment of the committee would quite certainly produce important economies.

The most economical and efficient use of many items of equipment, particularly heavy machinery, tractors, road graders, and so forth, is secured only through fullest possible use of such items during their normal life period. Every general contractor knows this and fights against the waste of idle equipment against which the factors of depreciation and interest on investment are constantly running. Lack of fluidity of use with respect to Government-owned heavy equipment likewise causes duplication of investments and stocking by neighbor agencies, and excessive depreciation costs per unit of work performed. Limitations in existing legislation plainly discourage best utilization. Such limitations have been removed with respect to certain agencies such as the Forest Service and the Public Roads Administration. Section 259 would place all agencies upon an equal footing in this respect.

Section 260 is designed to be operative only in time of war. This section would extend the authority to sell or lease for war purposes any Government-owned equipment, materials, or supplies. As was pointed out in the committee report to H. R. 1294, much of the equipment (such as air-conditioning units and boilers and pumps of various kinds) is attached to and is a part of the buildings belonging to the Government and authority does not exist to permit its release. On numerous field projects of the Government which have been closed down for the duration of the war there are quantities of Government-owned fabricated steel, lumber, and other construction materials which it should be possible to pick up and put to use in the prosecution of the war.

Section 261 permits necessary freedom in delegation of authority by the President and the heads of executive agencies. It also authorizes the President to utilize the services and facilities of any unit of the executive branch in effectuating the purposes of this legislation.

Title III of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, established the office of the Comptroller General and defined his powers, duties, and functions. Nothing in the bill now reported should in any way affect that title, and section 262 removes any question on this point.

Section 263 specifically exempts from any effects of the proposed legislation certain provisions of law which the committee believes should be so exempted. Major exemptions are the authority of the Secretary of the Navy to dispose of vessels stricken from the Navy Register; that of the War and Navy Departments to interchange military stores, supplies, and equipment; the operations of the Maritime Commission and the War Shipping Administration under the Merchant Marine Act of 1936, as amended; the lend-lease programs, and the authorities of all agencies under the First and Second War Powers Acts. Except as specified in this section, the new legislation would modify or supersede all existing laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus equipment, materials, and supplies to the extent of any conflict.

Section 263 concludes the amendment of the Budget and Accounting Act.

Section 2 of the bill defers application to the War and Navy Departments, Maritime Commission, and War Shipping Administration of the program of management and disposal under H. R. 2795 until 6 months after the termination of the war, or such earlier time as the Congress may designate, except to such extent as the heads of those agencies may find desirable.

WAR SURPLUSES

Various estimates have been made of the value of such property likely to be on hand at the termination of hostilities and it appears that such values may aggregate as much as \$50,000,000,000.

Recognizing that legislation necessary to deal effectively with these war surpluses should be enacted only after most thorough study and investigation, and recognizing also the urgent necessity of enacting the general program of property management provided by H. R. 2795, the committee has added sections 3 and 4 to permit enactment of the general program and at the same time provide for the necessary study of the war surplus problem, and the development of legislation to deal comprehensively with that problem.

Section 3 would render the general program inoperative with respect to surplus war materials after the date upon which hostilities cease.

Section 4 provides for the creation of a joint congressional committee to make the required investigation of war surpluses and methods of disposition and finally report to the Congress not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of the proposed legislation with recommendations as to necessary additional legislation and administrative action. The committee is directed to include within the scope of its studies, real property acquired or held for war purposes as well as personal property. The committee is also directed to submit

interim reports before the final report is made.

Section 5 of the bill is the customary authorization for such appropriations as the Congress may find necessary to effectuate its purposes. New appropriations will be necessary in the Executive Office of the President and the Treasury Department. It has been well demonstrated, however, by the partial controls already applied under Executive Order No. 9235 that such new appropriations will be offset manifold by savings and direct returns to the Treasury resulting from sound management practices in this field.

Section 6 of the bill provides that this act may be cited as the "Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943."

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH] 25 minutes.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to take a few moments to point out to the Members of this body that the work of our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments is an excellent example of the new vigilance which has been evident in this Congress. Because this body has delegated its powers without realizing the extent of the powers that it was giving up or without realizing what a broad interpretation might be placed upon such delegations of power, our whole system of constitutional government has been threatened.

Our committee has been aware of the far-reaching implications of the bill as originally presented to us and we have made an effort to replace the undefined terminology of the original bill, H. R. 1610, with exact and carefully defined terms.

In a note which accompanied the original draft of the bill submitted to us the President stated its purpose as follows:

To promote a more effective utilization of Government supplies and equipment both during and after the war.

We agreed with the President that legislation is needed for this purpose, but it would take very little imagination to see how this seemingly innocent legislation could by interpretation have been turned into one of the greatest grabs of power which the administration has ever made.

If the original bill had been enacted into law, it would practically have meant that we would have delegated to the executive branch the constitutional power of Congress to release or otherwise dispose of rights and property of the United States.

To give an example of the extent to which the proposed bill went, I call your attention to the language in section 220 of the original bill. It read:

When the United States is in a state of war, and upon determination by the President that any land, building, appurtenant facilities, or fixtures, or any supplies, materials, equipment, or instruments owned by the Government and devoted to a particular use are urgently needed in the conduct of the war, are not subject to disposition as surplus property, and cannot otherwise be provided, he may authorize or direct the head of the

agency having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, to sell to nongovernmental agencies such property—

And so forth. Think what this would have meant—the President could have sold to nongovernmental agencies the land and improvements owned by the United States. The latest available report on how much the United States owns in land and improvements is the report of the Public Buildings Administration

dated June 30, 1940, and even in this report the latest figures for the cost of improvements for War and Navy Departments are their 1937 figures. According to this report the United States owned 368,816,289 acres or almost one-fifth—19.38 percent—of all the land in the United States. This land and improvements cost us over \$5,000,000,000. A few of the items included in this report are as follows:

Sample items taken from record of Federal real estate, by agencies (as of June 30, 1940)—
Report made by Federal Works Agency, Public Buildings Administration

Department and agency	Number of projects	Total acreage	Cost of Federal real estate		
			Land	Improvements	Total
Agriculture: Farm Security Administration	353	568,107	\$22,764,172	\$92,662,679	\$115,426,851
Navy: Yards and Docks	182	499,961	25,674,127	488,066,328	513,741,265
War:					
Corps of Engineers	1,028	1,730,142	57,322,083	567,658,910	624,980,993
Quartermaster Corps	549	2,116,862	62,482,223	630,884,672	693,366,895
Independent offices:					
Architect of the Capitol	16	206	17,269,166	76,975,169	94,244,335
Federal Reserve Board	1	5	737,180	3,801,861	4,539,041
Federal Works Agency:					
(A) Public Buildings Administration	278	567	60,100,412	238,255,224	298,355,636
(2) Surplus Property	128	1,369	3,764,445	22,405,550	26,169,995
(B) Public Roads Administration	6	111	159,041	2,456,755	2,615,796
(C) U. S. Housing Authority	47	933	19,087,870	107,204,221	126,292,091
Home Owners Loan Corporation	1	1	1,141,500	1,559,378	2,700,878
Smithsonian Institution	14	199	276,561	8,767,180	9,043,741
Soldiers' Home	1	500	326,193	5,474,985	5,801,178
U. S. Maritime Commission	7	897	2,302,703	48,713,233	51,015,936
Veterans' Administration	96	64,151	11,919,067	195,564,691	207,483,758
Grand total (includes omitted items)	14,338	368,816,289	691,524,231	4,409,771,729	5,101,295,960

¹ 1937 improvement figure (1940 improvement figure not available).

These figures do not, however, present a true and accurate picture since they represent cost and not present-day values. It must be borne in mind that most of this acreage was acquired without cost.

Moreover, we have added a great deal since July 1, 1940, as a result of our war program. For instance, the War Department has acquired approximately 18,800,000 acres, of which 12,000,000 acres were already Government-owned lands transferred from other departments and the balance was purchased from private owners. Between July 1, 1940, and January 15, 1943, the Navy Department has purchased 813,382.59 acres, making an original deposit on them of \$82,062,606.78.

In determining what property is owned by the United States it is also necessary to consider such agencies as the Defense Plant Corporation which has built, equipped, and now owns over 1,479 plants and facilities costing approximately \$7,000,000,000, the disposition of which in itself will certainly present a complex problem at the close of the war.

Congress made some provision for surplus real property when it passed the act of August 27, 1935—Public, No. 351, Seventy-fourth Congress—which provides that whenever—

Any real property located outside the District of Columbia, exclusive of military or naval reservations, is declared to be in excess of its needs by the Federal agency having control thereof, or by the President, on recommendation of the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of Procurement with the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury, is authorized (a) to assign or reassign to any Federal agency or agencies space therein, (b) to lease, or (c) to sell the same.

An example of property that could have been disposed of under the original H. R. 1610 was the Soldiers' Home. In the hearings before our committee—page 159—Mr. W. E. Reynolds, Commissioner of Public Buildings, stated, in answer to a question from me, that the Soldiers' Home could have been disposed of had the words "land and buildings" remained in the bill. The Soldiers' Home property is now valued at about \$10,000,000 and its 500 acres includes 140 acres in buildings and lawns, 200 acres of woodland, and 160 acres in farm land.

Some of you may recall that last year there was some talk of this land being used as a housing project and the soldiers presented a petition to Congress protesting. This petition, which appears on page 998 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 3, 1942, as part of the remarks of the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, is in part as follows:

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, within the last hour 3 aged veterans from the Soldiers' Home in Washington have furnished me a petition containing three and one-half pages of typewritten matter from occupants of the United States Soldiers' Home, now having some 1,400 members. They furnished me a petition signed by more than 900 of the occupants of the home and asked that I present to the Congress this, their petition.

It is my information that this property was acquired by the United States Government as a soldiers' home about 90 years ago. It is now proposed by some groups of people in Washington that they take over this property for the purpose of converting it into a housing project under the emergency of national defense—another one of the many things that is being cloaked in the robes of national defense interests in order to do something that ought not be done.

It is my information that the title to this property contains a bar against that kind of procedure; that it contains a restrictive clause which provided that this should not be done. I am not asserting this as a fact, but that is my information from these gentlemen. That provision provides that if and when the property is converted to any other use than the use for which it was intended—that is, a home for disabled soldiers—the title shall revert to the heirs or the estate of the donor or grantor, as the case may have been. Of course, that is a complete statutory bar to taking it except with that condition.

This last paragraph of Mr. May's statement is in error. Title rests in the United States with no penalty restrictions involved. The Congress can dispose of the property which it now holds as trustee for the soldiers. Mr. May continued his statement as follows:

I simply present this petition on behalf of those old soldiers, with the hope that Members of the House will read it, and if and when there is a proposal in the Appropriations Committee or the House Military Affairs Committee, or any other committee of Congress, that due notice will be taken of the right of these dependent defenders of our country.

I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and include this petition therewith.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

The petition referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SOLDIERS' HOME,
Washington, D. C., February 2, 1942.

To the Congress of the United States:

We, the undersigned, members of the United States Soldiers' Home, respectfully request your interest and protection in behalf of the thousands of veterans throughout the United States who are now entitled to the benefits of this home.

1. This home was established by an act of Congress approved March 3, 1851. By this act the Congress retained under its own jurisdiction the trusteeship for the old, infirm, and disabled soldiers of the Regular Army. The Regular Army veterans, therefore, have no one to look to for protection save the Congress and, in the 91 years of the existence of this home, they have never petitioned in vain. We know that we shall not be denied your protection now. For now we are under attack. Commercial interests are trying, under the guise of national defense, and civilian requirements, to get our property away from us and have proposed to send us "down the river" to land less desirable.

2. At this same time every effort is being made by the Park Commissioners to provide adequate parks and places of amusement for the residents of the District of Columbia. Now, what is this land but a public park? And it was the first such public park in the District of Columbia, maintained without one cent of cost to the taxpayer of either the District or the National Government. The entire cost of maintaining this home is paid by the enlisted men on the active list of the Regular Army. With the exception of the actual living quarters of the members in barracks and hospital, every bit of this land constitutes a public park of which there are all too few in the District. A glance at the record will show the following facilities of the reservation to be available to the public generally:

(a) Over 11 miles of surfaced roads within our gates open for traffic. We pay all costs of maintenance.

(b) Our gates are open 24 hours a day for public traffic, and over 99 percent of the traffic is by the public.

(c) Our grounds are extensively used as playgrounds for children, adults, their families, and friends.

(d) In winter we provide sledding hills for children and adults with protection against harm by our own local police.

(e) At Easter we provide egg-rolling lawns for crowds even greater than can be accommodated at the White House because we have a greater expanse of lawn.

(f) Throughout the entire summer we have evening band concerts attended by a large number of residents of the District of Columbia and visiting tourists.

(g) Sightseeing busses have the home on their itineraries and, recognizing it as one of the beauty spots of the District of Columbia, bring a large number of tourists here. Those who appreciate the beauty of the grand panoramic view of the entire city of Washington and the magnificent forest of trees have no wish to see these destroyed to make room for concrete buildings or commercial activities.

(h) We have built and maintain baseball fields for the children of the surrounding community, who use it freely, never realizing for a moment that this is not a public park. They think it is.

(i) Howard University is authorized to drill and train its Reserve Officers' Training Corps recruits on designated grounds.

(j) During the school year at least three grades, from kindergarten through high school, visit the home dairy and chicken farm weekly—frequently coming in busses accompanied by their teachers. College and university students and constituents of Members of Congress, particularly from rural districts, in the city on sightseeing tours, visit and inspect the modern dairy and thoroughbred Holstein herd of cattle, both from interest and educational purposes.

We are very proud of the historic honor which has been bestowed upon this home in the past when the soldiers of the Regular Army here were given the privilege of entertaining as a summer White House three Presidents of the United States, namely, Mr. Lincoln, Mr. Buchanan, and Mr. Hayes.

3. We not only live in this community and have our large group of friends here among the residential population, but as a group we contribute freely out of the meager compensation we receive to every charitable activity in Washington; in fact, we are among the first to be approached when the Red Cross, Community Chest, the Mile of Dimes, and others need help.

4. It has been estimated that there are now at least 2,000,000 veterans living all over the United States, who by their personal contributions have established their eligibility for membership in this home and who have a paid-up interest in it, even though they do not find it convenient to come here until they get old or need hospitalization. There may be added to this many more veterans of the present terrible combat. For the boys now in service there is nothing too good, and it is our hope that we may keep this home for them also. It may be stated here that of the number of resident members in this home at the present time, over 500 served in the World War; it is our firm belief that the citizens of the United States did not look upon us as parasites 20 years ago, and our brothers in service at this time should not look forward to being called parasites 20 years hence.

5. This home is our pride, the pride of the soldiers of the Regular Army. It has taken the contributions of several millions of them to build and maintain it, and we speak for each and every one of them when we ask you, as our duly constituted trustees, to protect our interests and insure that this institution shall remain forever intact, to be passed on to future old, infirm, and disabled members of the Regular Army in the same splendid condition, or even better, than when we received it from our predecessors.

6. In conclusion, we wish to go on record and assure you that we have the utmost confidence in the officers of this home, and we

ask that before Congress ever even considers any proposition to destroy the effectiveness of this home, or its property, that no action be taken until after the officers of this home, its board of commissioners, and, above all, its governor, Maj. Gen. Frederick W. Coleman, have been heard from. General Coleman will speak well for us and for the millions of other veterans who have established an eligibility for this home; we know that he will leave nothing undone in our behalf.

Very respectfully yours,

BENJAMIN I. MOTLEY,
CHARLES M. ARMSTRONG,
HERMAN VEAN,

Committee, Representing Members,
United States Soldiers' Home,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. Chairman, under the terms of H. R. 1610, Congress would have been helpless in doing anything to prevent the sale, conversion, or other disposition of this property. Our committee wisely decided that Congress should not delegate the power to dispose of such vast amounts of land, buildings, appurtenant facilities, and so forth, and, therefore, the property covered in H. R. 2795 includes only supplies, materials, or equipment—not land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities, or fixtures, or any gold or silver. I hope that when Congress does consider the question of surplus lands and buildings it will not forget the petition signed by more than 900 occupants of the Soldiers' Home.

The committee then turned its attention to determining how much the bill, H. R. 1610, would cover when limited to supplies, materials, and equipment. As you will note from the committee report, we were amazed to find that no one knows what property the United States Government owns. Although the Government owns billions of dollars worth of property, there are no complete records of such properties. None of the departments have unified inventories.

The only comprehensive list of property that I was able to obtain was the Standard Stock Catalog which lists almost 30,000 different items now handled by the Procurement Division of the Treasury Department, which procures or stores them. This alphabetical list ranges from abaci to zirconium-oxide, and includes almost anything you can think of, for example, aircraft, boats, and ships; animals; boilers, engines, tanks; chemicals; food; fuel; furniture; generators and motors; hardware; leather and leather goods; lumber and timber; machinery; metals; metal products; rubber and rubber goods; textile products; tools; vehicles, motortrucks, and so forth. However, this Standard Stock Catalog does not give amounts, so one has no idea of the value of the property now in the possession of the Government which might possibly become surplus. I cannot imagine a successful business of any kind being operated without any record of the properties owned by the business.

Everywhere our investigations showed poor management of properties. To illustrate how confused the records on property are, one agency's report to Congress on expenditures was \$2,457,000,000 less than the figures the agency gave me in a confidential report on their purchases. Because of this lack of records,

and also because of the lack of uniformity in the standards for the utilization of property, the committee revised the bill to require inventories and uniform standards in the utilization of equipment, materials, and supplies, and we centered the responsibility for this in the Bureau of the Budget.

We realize, of course, that the real problem of disposing of surpluses will come at the end of this war, when, in all probability, the Federal Government will have surplus stocks of almost unimaginable size. Naturally, the War and Navy Departments cannot—for military reasons—reveal inventories of their present equipment, and if they could it would be impossible to say how much of this equipment will be destroyed or used and how much of it will be surplus at the close of hostilities. This may depend upon how soon and how suddenly the war comes to a conclusion.

We may get some idea of probable surpluses at the end of this war by examining the surpluses at the end of World War No. 1. At that time about 100,000 items became surplus in the War Department alone. New goods which had cost us almost \$4,000,000,000 had to be disposed of—to say nothing of old supplies. War Department sales of surpluses included such items as airplanes which had cost almost \$70,000,000, wool costing \$324,000,000, machinery and engineering equipment costing \$29,000,000, and ships, barges, and floating equipment costing \$26,000,000. At that time at least 7,000,000 new pairs of shoes were declared surplus. Over 5,500,000 blankets were declared surplus. The War Department offered over 10,000,000 pieces of underwear for sale. Food declared surplus included 25,000,000 cans of beans, 31,000,000 of corn, 24,000,000 cans of peas, 84,000,000 cans of tomatoes, 45,000,000 pounds of bacon, and 38,000,000 pounds of roast beef. Part of our surplus railroad equipment was sold to the French Government for over \$77,000,000. On September 30, 1920, the Quartermaster General still had on hand 3,275,584 new woolen service coats, 885,620 new woolen overcoats, 2,028,924 new leather jerkins, 5,802,892 new flannel shirts, 1,671,540 new wool trousers, and so forth, to mention a few items.

The money we spent on materials and equipment in the last war was only a drop in the bucket compared to what we are spending in this war. Consider, for instance, how the number of airplanes in the last war compares with the number in this war. At the end of World War No. 1 we had in commission 16,952 planes of all kinds, including 5,198 produced for us by the Allies. We had manufactured 16,000 Liberty engines. In last Monday's—June 7—papers we read that aircraft production will reach a \$20,000,000,000 total this year for transport and combat planes combined and is scheduled to exceed \$30,000,000,000 next year. The O. W. I. predicted that we would have 500,000 airplanes in the United States by 1950. Some of these planes are now capable of carrying 60 tons of cargo.

Each day newspaper accounts refer to the equipment now being turned out in huge quantities for our armed forces.

We read of jeeps that swim, climb, and fly, of sky trains turned out by a plant in Oklahoma, of a fleet of new destroyer escorts, of aircraft carriers produced on a mass scale by Mr. Kaiser, of a new air-cooled submarine costing over \$6,000,000. In March of this year we turned out 146 ships aggregating 1,516,000 dead-weight tons. This would be the equivalent of 18,000,000 tons a year or 5 ships a day. We have shipped almost as many tanks abroad on a single transport as the total number in World War No. 1. Supplying armies overseas has required the shipment from the United States of cargo averaging 82 pounds per day per man. In the first year of this war we shipped overseas 10,474,923 measurement tons of Army freight, not including shipments to the Allies. If you recall some of the items in the Navy budget you will form some idea of the tremendous amount being spent on equipment—for example, over nine billion on shipbuilding.

The Government may have huge quantities of certain commodities on hand at the end of this war. We have already contracted for 1,370,000,000 pounds of aluminum. On April 6, the Office of the Rubber Director stated that the Government owned 720,000 tons of crude and scrap rubber, not including tires. An article in the Washington Post of April 14 says:

The synthetic rubber program was reported ready for a production of 813,000 tons in 1943, one-third to be produced from alcohol.

We know, also, that the Government has been purchasing huge quantities of foods. The American Institute of Food Distribution reported in March that the canners were holding between 40 and 75 percent of their entire pack of canned fruits and vegetables for the Government. According to the press, the United States has agreed to purchase 2,700,000 tons of sugar from Cuba in 1943.

In short, the War and Navy Departments are buying now enough food, clothing, blankets, tents, cots, mess equipment, medical and dental supplies, and so forth, to equip an army of at least 10,000,000 men. The vast quantities of supplies we will have on hand if the war comes to a sudden conclusion are almost beyond human imagination. It is anticipated that the surpluses will be worth at least \$50,000,000,000, as compared to \$5,000,000,000 at the end of the last war. In all probability there will be a great deal still in production when hostilities cease.

The problem which will confront this body will be to see that as much of this material as possible is turned into useful material for peacetime purposes. We must get the jeeps, trucks, and tractors onto the farms or use them in road building, and we must get the planes and ships into commerce. We must dispose of these surpluses with the least possible loss as far as the Government is concerned, but in doing so we must not destroy private business. Dumping of such huge amounts of goods on the market might wreck our peacetime economy. In a way the Government will be going into business in competition with private industry and the results may be disastrous for our economic system. There will also be the question of what to do

with Government-owned war plants after the war.

The committee realized the complexity of the problems connected with the disposal of war surpluses and felt that further investigation of this whole matter was necessary. For this reason H. R. 2795 does not provide for the sale of surplus war materials after hostilities cease, except that scrap or material worn beyond repair can be sold. War surpluses can be transferred or leased to other agencies.

Section 4 of the bill also provides for a joint congressional committee to make a further study of this whole matter of disposing of surplus war materials after hostilities cease. I want to make it very clear that I am in favor of this entire bill except section 4. I expect to move at the proper time to strike out section 4. That section would mean that the committee of which I am a member and of which the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] is a distinguished member, will, after working for 5 long months on this important subject of surpluses, pass the responsibility to others. I, for one, believe that it is the function of the regular committees of the House, especially in this case, to study this problem. I believe that we should not pass this responsibility on to others, and that we should not authorize the appropriation of \$10,000 for a special committee. I agree with the sentiments expressed by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. CLARK] when he stated a few moments ago that we shall soon reach the point where we will be confronted with the necessity of appointing a committee to investigate the special investigating committees. Our committee has spent several months investigating this matter. The printed hearings have just now come in. The corrected and final hearings are the ones which contain on pages 159 and 160 a reference to the Soldiers' Home petition to this Congress asking it not to allow anything to happen that would let someone sell its land or buildings. I hope the Members will examine these final hearings.

Mr. CASE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. Is the gentleman advocating that the surplus property of the War and Navy Departments be brought under the terms of the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am advocating the bill with the exception of section 4. Section 263 of the bill specifically exempts 16 different statutes, most of which deal with the War and Navy Departments. I have here a list of statutes which are either repealed or repealed in part—16 statutes are exempted in this bill; 19 statutes, I believe, if I am correct in the number, are not affected; 114 statutes modified or not affected.

Mr. CASE. I assume the gentleman has examined those statutes carefully. I would like to ask him what is the character of those statutes which are repealed; the general character of them.

Mr. CHURCH. They relate generally to the War and Navy Departments. I refer the gentleman to this final report of the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I have always contended that the Government should adopt more businesslike methods, particularly in the handling of Government property. Although this supposedly was the aim of the original bill, I could not approve it because it would have meant that Congress would be giving away its power to dispose of properties amounting to staggering figures. Our committee has limited the bill sufficiently to prevent any great loss of congressional control, and I believe the amended bill we reported adequately provides for handling ordinary surpluses so that we may have the most effective use of Government properties possible. Let us make this just the first step in a drive for more efficient, more economical government. It is time for us to apply the common sense rules of good business management for only by so doing can we make our system of government succeed.

Mr. Chairman, in conclusion I feel that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] should be complimented on the very excellent report he has made on the bill. I, of course, disagree with him as to section 4. The committee and our chairman, the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'LEARY], should be commended for a fine piece of work, the result of many, many hours of patient study and investigation. Our committee has taken an innocent looking bill, H. R. 1610, entitled "A bill to amend the Budget and Accounting Act of 1921," which was potentially a threat to congressional power, and has completely rewritten it after four committee reprints into a bill worthy of the name that H. R. 2795 carries, the Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943.

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. BENNETT].

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 2795. This bill is of particular interest to the citizens of my Sixth Missouri Congressional District by reason of the burning of Civilian Conservation Corps equipment, to which I will make further reference in a moment. The bill before us proposes to establish a Surplus War Property Committee of five Senators and five Representatives. This committee would be authorized to make a prompt and complete study of the types, qualities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, real and personal, which may reasonably be expected to be in possession or control of any agency at the end of the war. The committee would be ordered to report to Congress the results of this investigation within 6 months, together with recommendations for legislation and administrative action to insure orderly disposition of the property. The committee which submits this bill to us for approval now has wisely said:

Our problem is to see that these enormous supplies will be wisely disposed of. Otherwise they might be used to destroy private enterprise. Our soldiers, when they come back, will want to work in private industry, not at raking leaves for the Government. Unless these materials are wisely handled,

there will be more millionaires made after the war than during it.

The report of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments also says:

Efficient executive management of the Government's great and growing investment in equipment, materials, and supplies, and the control of the Congress over the use and disposition of such property are seriously handicapped by the lack of comprehensive legislation. The essential foundation of management standards in determining what quantities should be bought, and similar standards to govern utilization, are conspicuous by their absence. Although the accrual of surpluses is an inevitable feature of the active operations of government, the determination and release of such surpluses is entirely within the discretion of thousands of widely scattered executives. Good house-keeping in government obviously requires that surplus equipment, materials, and supplies be disposed of promptly and efficiently. Yet excepting statutes which deal with specific segments of the Government and with specific categories of property, the executive authority for disposal of surpluses is only implied, and the methods of disposal undefined.

I well remember that after the last war certain individuals with influence in the War Department were able to buy at bargain prices vast quantities of war materials which they sold at retail to the public. Every town had its "army store." Great fortunes were made at public expense. On the other hand, much of this material, clothing, airplanes, tools, and so forth, was simply piled up and burned. That got the Government into a bad habit which it has pursued to the present day. I sincerely hope that enactment of the bill before us will go a long way toward putting an end to such a practice.

C. C. C. FIRES IN MISSOURI

In April 1943 the people of Missouri were shocked by disclosures that abandoned equipment from five Civilian Conservation Corps camps in the Mark Twain National Forest, in Missouri, had been collected and burned under supervision of the local Forest Service director. It was burned, according to the director, because there was no legal way these wheelbarrows, saws, picks, shovels, plows, seed sowers, wheels, axes, and so forth, could be given away or sold to the farmers needing them except by untangling red tape over a period of 2 ensuing years.

When this incredible situation was called to my attention, I at once asked the Secretary of War, the Secretary of Agriculture, and the Federal Security Administrator for a full report and investigation. After a lot of buck-passing between these officials, I got no information. Then I prevailed upon the Military Affairs Committee of the House of Representatives to conduct an investigation. An able investigator was sent to the scene of the bonfires and there interviewed witnesses and fixed responsibility.

To make a long but interesting story short, it developed that 2,100 items of property, much of it rationed and unobtainable by farmers in the area, had been destroyed. Much of this material

was new. The estimated value of the total was between one and two thousand dollars. On May 20, 1943, after the committee had submitted its report, I received a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture admitting that an error had been made in disposition of the property and that action had been taken to prevent any further similar occurrences in his Department. This incident was hard on the morale of the people. They sent their sons to war. They bought Government bonds. They paid increased taxes. And they saw their Government waste their substance.

Today this House is considering legislation which involves not \$2,000 worth of Government property but between fifty and one hundred million dollars worth. Certainly there is every reason to believe that the measure before us is an intelligent preliminary approach to a serious problem. Adoption of this measure, I believe, will be good insurance against future fires. We owe it to the people, as Members of Congress, to save their money and by so doing to preserve the soundness of our economic structure. There has been too much of this business of playing fast and loose with the other fellow's pocketbook.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I feel impelled to say a few kind words about the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. I had been led to understand that it was a committee which never, by any chance, had any bill referred to it and never had anything to do.

The legislation that has been referred to it is legislation of the utmost importance. The bill which is now being considered deals with only one aspect of a very great situation, namely, the disposition of surplus Government property, whether land or buildings, or personal property, whether during the war or after the war.

This bill is narrow in scope. It deals only with "property" which is defined as supplies and materials, or equipment, or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any Government-controlled corporation and does not include land or buildings or fixtures or appurtenant facilities, or gold or silver. We have in mind, of course, the Government-owned gold in Kentucky or the silver at West Point.

The committee made a very careful study of this whole legislative project and the field with which it attempts to deal. The really amazing thing to me about this bill is that it was not passed at least as early as the year 1812. It certainly ought to have been passed then, and every day of delay in passing a measure of this sort is regrettable, because throughout the history of the United States, even in its most modest beginning, the Government must have had some surplus property. The passage of this bill would eliminate dealing with this property by directives, by Executive orders, and by other pseudo-legislative devices, that were resorted to even in the last war. President Wilson, on Decem-

ber 3, 1918, issued an Executive order, No. 3019. I merely want to call attention to the fact that even in those crude days they could do pretty well piling up Executive orders. That Executive order dealt simply with the disposal of surplus property in the District of Columbia and it was not until 10 years later that Congress passed appropriate legislation dealing with property in the District of Columbia.

Those who have already spoken have emphasized many of the provisions of the bill and I do not desire to cover the same field. I would simply call attention to one or two of the provisions which seem to me important. I think that the inventory provisions, which are found in section 252, are extremely valuable. There was no preexisting legislative requirement for the Government to know anything about what the various bureaus and agencies actually owned.

I would also like to call attention to the provisions of section 263, about which there seems to have been some misunderstanding. In this section you will find enumerated 16 preexisting statutes. Those statutes are not repealed. They are left subsisting, with the exception that "all laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus property or the disposal of proceeds therefrom are modified and superseded to the extent of any conflict with the provisions of this title."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield? I dislike to interrupt his interesting presentation.

Mr. HALE. I gladly yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Is it not true that in including these 16 sections the committee and the gentleman chiefly among the members of the committee interrogated the Army and the Navy and the war-service agencies to be very certain that we had exempted any legislation that might otherwise authorize the disposition of any material essential to the prosecution of the war?

Mr. HALE. The gentleman from Mississippi is entirely correct, and we had the statutes searched very carefully for any legislation that might be affected by this bill or that would be undesirably affected by this bill, and the statutes which are being preserved by that exemption contained in section 263, are statutes which were deemed valuable by the War Department, the Navy Department, the Maritime Commission, and so on.

It appeared at the outset that the Secretary of the Navy was a little bit afraid that the Director of the Budget might sell a battleship as surplus material, and we did everything possible to allay any apprehensions that he might have upon that point.

I trust, Mr. Chairman, that this bill will obtain unanimous passage, because I think it deserves it.

Mr. HALE. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from California [Mr. POULSON].

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated

that he was surprised to have such an important bill referred to this committee. It is my belief that not only the members of the committee but those who sponsored the bill did not realize how important it was; otherwise the bill never would have been referred to this committee. As it is, however, it turns out to be what I think is one of the most important pieces of legislation which will confront this session of Congress; in fact I think this is just the start of legislation along this line; this is really a preliminary step.

We have all heard the old adage that the time to repair the roof is in the summer—not on a day like this—rather than waiting until winter. The time to consider legislation such as contained in this bill is the present, not waiting until the time when it is necessary to dispose of these billions of dollars of surpluses—and I call attention to the fact that it is spelled with a "B" instead of "M"—it is billions we shall have to deal with in the matter of surpluses to be disposed of after the war.

When we opened these hearings we were like people drilling for a water well but discovering oil; in other words we soon began to realize the wide scope this bill covered; we were beginning to realize that this would affect the economy of the country, that it would offer the greatest opportunity for graft since the First World War; in fact I may say that we have already found many people who deal in second-hand commodities making inquiries as to the prospective disposition of this bill. I found it was an important bill and I consider section 4 very important. I take the same stand as does the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] that this bill is so important that the best men in Congress should be placed on this committee. I feel we have some of those men in our committee, but if the leaders on both the majority and minority sides consider that other Members should serve on it I feel that the job is big enough that they should approach the problem in that fashion. I will say, however, that this committee has spent 4 months of intensive study on the work and there are many Members on the committee who are qualified; so I do not have the same fears some of the Members do.

The thing that appalled me and something I never realized was that the Government set-up is so inadequate that although we have set up proper procedures for appropriation of money and the spending of money we have no machinery set up to dispose of such things as surpluses; in fact this is one of the reasons why they destroy materials, burn them, give them away, or abandon them, because the "red tape" they have to go through otherwise is so great they cannot dispose of it. Because of my profession I was particularly interested in the subject of inventories. I was absolutely surprised and shocked to find out that the Government had no check, did not have any type of inventory, did not know anything about the quantities of any particular commodities they had in any particular department.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. Similar statements have been made before. I was just wondering if the Commodity Credit Corporation does not keep inventory of everything they have. I imagine some of the other departments do also.

Mr. POULSON. That is a separate corporation, I understand. I am speaking now of the general set-up of the principal departments. They have not operated at all on a business basis. I would be surprised if any business would be able to continue very long operating as the Government has in many of its business enterprises.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I did not get the import of the question asked by the gentlewoman from Illinois.

Miss SUMNER of Illinois. My remark was that at a recent hearing before the Committee on Banking and Currency it was developed that the Commodity Credit Corporation kept a complete inventory of its assets and liabilities every year, and I wondered if that situation did not exist also in the case of other corporations of the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the gentlewoman's question?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. That may be true of corporations; unfortunately it is not true of the Government; and, mind you, this has to do with governmental inventories rather than the inventories of corporations. I believe that answers the gentlewoman's question.

Mr. POULSON. We believe this bill will correct that situation.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a correction of the record?

Mr. POULSON. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. The gentleman from Mississippi realizes that the effect of this bill is on the administrative properties which is different from the inventories of Government corporations. Is not that right?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Unquestionably, but the gentlewoman from Illinois asked about the inventory of property of the Surplus Commodities Corporation and I specifically stated that insofar as the corporation is concerned they had their inventory, but this provides for an inventory of administrative corporations, and not real-estate corporations.

Mr. POULSON. This bill provides for the handling of surplus Government property. This bill can definitely be stated as being in two parts, one dependent upon the other. The main bill sets up the machinery and procedure by which we may dispose of surpluses, such as we had today in the case of the W. P. A. and the C. C. C., without all the red tape which has heretofore been necessary. This brings a little more efficiency into governmental procedure. This legislation does not purport to establish procedure for post-war disposal of surpluses. We are contemplating future legislation to take care of that problem.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. With respect to the investigation of this committee as to real estate, the gentleman was most attentive and most helpful in the hearings. I would like to ask the gentleman if this is not a correct statement with reference to the inquiries of the committee as to Government real estate: If there was one subject that the committee pursued most diligently without ascertaining full information it was as to the various kinds of real estate, including hotels and other institutions, bought by the war agencies since this war began.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. And if we need an investigation of any one thing, that is the one we need it on.

Mr. POULSON. That is correct.

Mr. Chairman, I consider that section 4 is just as important as the other parts of the bill. I feel that the integrity of the leadership of this House is such that they will appoint the best men and in doing so they will look over the present committee. If they feel that the ability is there, which I know it is, they will be fair in their discretion and I do not feel that we should use our selfish motives in opposing such a wise bill with so much importance attached to it.

Mr. BISHOP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. BISHOP. Did the gentleman have it called to his attention about the machinery and equipment that is now stored from the C. C. C. camps, also from the N. Y. A., and also from the W. P. A.?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. That stuff at the present time is being burned?

Mr. POULSON. That is right. We do not have any machinery set up to dispose of that in any fashion satisfactory to the department heads. They all have a certain responsibility that makes them hesitant to dispose of it.

Mr. BISHOP. In other words, this committee then would look into that phase of the matter?

Mr. POULSON. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. POULSON. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. Did I understand the gentleman to agree with the statement that some property is being burned at this time?

Mr. POULSON. The subject was brought up by the gentleman from Iowa that he knew of lumber being burned, and it was brought out in the committee by our very distinguished ranking Member that in his territory they burned wood and many other materials because they did not have any method of disposing of it. That was the answer given to us by some of the department heads.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER].

Mr. BENDER. Mr. Chairman, the question of inventories on the part of governmental departments is extremely important. Very few of the membership are aware of the fact that there is no inventory kept of Government property. It seems amazing that the biggest business in the world should not know exactly how much property it owns, but that is the condition of the United States Government today. This bill is merely an approach to this great problem of surplus commodities. As has been pointed out, some \$50,000,000,000 is involved and this committee is endeavoring to approach the problem through the present bill.

I have been asked by any number of Members, "Are you for this bill"? Of course we are for the bill. We believe it is the first genuine effort that has been made to approach this problem in a sensible, businesslike manner. I am sure I voice the opinion of the minority members of the committee when I say that we are definitely for the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. MANASCO].

Mr. MANASCO. Mr. Chairman, today I find that the House is just about as anxious to know something about how this bill got to the floor as we were with reference to how it got to our committee. When the bill was first introduced, it was a very interesting piece of legislation, and I refer to the original H. R. 1610. I think my friend, Mr. Scott, representing the Budget Bureau, who is probably listening now, will tell you that the Committee on Executive Expenditures is probably one of the hardest committees to convince that the Budget Bureau's position is right that they have been before in the House. When you look over on the Democratic side you find the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON], who can ask about as many questions as anybody and when you get over to the Republican side you find the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] who can ask many questions and makes a few ironic observations from time to time; the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BENDER] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], do the same.

I do not think that the House need fear this legislation because it certainly has been gone into very capably and very ably by Members on both sides of the House. There has been absolutely no partisanship. At times we were a little bit nasty with the Budget Bureau and sometimes I joined in those bitter attacks.

We were utterly amazed when we started the hearings to find out that there is no agency in the Government that knows how many desks, how many typewriters, how many pencils, how much of any material we have. We were amazed to find that the surpluses that the Government owns are being disposed of under about 134 statutes and the Lord knows how many Executive orders. As a matter of fact the surplus of between \$25,000,000 and \$40,000,000 of

W. P. A. material needs to be disposed of immediately. But it takes legislation to enable the Government through the Procurement Division to dispose of that property.

I have been somewhat interested in the distribution of the war surpluses. Of course, we all recognize the necessity of legislation to place in a central agency the distribution of administrative supplies, but enormous war supplies will be on hand at the end of this war. We hope we may have more than is necessary. Those war supplies will be so enormous that we could absolutely destroy private enterprise if we did not place every safeguard around the distribution of those supplies. It might interest you to know that at the end of the last war we had \$7,000,000,000 worth of surplus war material. At the end of this war it is estimated we will have anywhere from fifty to one hundred billion dollars worth of surplus war materials. We will probably have 150,000 airplane engines, we will have anywhere from 90,000 to 160,000 planes, and, of course, if we dump those planes on the market there would be quite a few people who could make millions of dollars out of it. This dumping would retard your aviation industry.

The creation of an organization to dispose of this enormous surplus after the cessation of hostilities will be a stupendous task. We have left room for that to be done, because we think more study should be given. We will have at least 10,000,000 men discharged from the Army. There will be at least 30,000,000 men who will be thrown out of work the day the armistice is declared. Those men will want to go into private industry and make an honest living. They will not want to rake leaves. They will not want to work under W. P. A. or some of these dreamy schemes that some of our planners have now. They want to come back to the American way of life.

I think it is most important that we protect our private enterprise and see that these men are given jobs in private enterprise. Of course, if it is necessary to absorb some of the people on public works, we will be compelled to do it, but the more that can be absorbed by private industry the better it will be for our way of life, for the workers, and for the taxpayers.

After the last war industry was able to speedily convert war-production plants to production for the civilian market, due to the fact that they were able to set aside large capital reserves out of the profits. That is something we should remember. In this war our industry is not going to have much set aside in the way of surplus to reconvert to peacetime production, because we are taking it away from it in taxes. After taxes most corporations will have less than one-tenth of the capital they had to convert to civilian production after the last war. Credits from banks will be hard to obtain due to the heavier investment in Government securities.

On November 11, 1918, war contractors held unfilled contracts in the sum of \$7,500,000,000. At the end of this war the unfilled contracts will be between \$75,000,000,000 and \$100,000,000,000. A much larger proportion of industry is en-

gaged in the production of war materials in this war than during the last war. This will make the problem of reconversion doubly difficult.

In disposing of the enormous surplus of war materials there will be plenty of room for corruption, fraud, and sharp practice. It will be possible, unless we surround the disposition of the surplus war material with every precaution, for the unscrupulous, the unethical, to make enormous profits. We can have more millionaires after the war is over just as easily as we can have them during the war. I am sure that today there are many of these unscrupulous characters in Washington with their eyes on this enormous surplus. We do not want it to fall into those hands, because it will have two bad effects. One of them is, it will be cheating the taxpayers out of a fair return on their investment, and the other is that it will be cheating us all when we destroy the very business that has made America great.

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I have just inquired of the chairman of the committee whether or not this bill as it is drawn will be broad enough to allow the Commodity Credit Corporation to dump surpluses of cotton and other materials.

Mr. MANASCO. I may say to the gentleman that in the committee I brought up that question because I am interested in cotton, and I found that under the original bill, H. R. 1610, the Government could have sold everything from a battleship to a toothpick, including all the supplies in the different corporations; so we specifically exempted all Government-owned corporations from the sale of any surplus except administrative equipment, such as desks, typewriters, pencils, and so forth.

Mr. WRIGHT. Where do you do this?

Mr. MANASCO. It is on page 4, line 19, subsection (b) of section 253:

In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

This excepts all the property owned by the Metals Reserve Company, the Defense Plant Corporation, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

Mr. WRIGHT. That would include surplus crops also, in the opinion of the gentleman?

Mr. MANASCO. We were afraid they might decide to try to sell some cotton and wheat, contrary to the will of Congress, so to keep them from doing this we put in this provision.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. I do not see how your bill can prevent a terrific drop in prices. You are going to have all these goods on your hands. How are you going to prevent the purchase of the goods at unconscionable prices?

Mr. MANASCO. That is the reason we want further study. We want the recommendation of everybody.

It may be interesting to know that I introduced a bill, H. R. 2498, that would create a board composed of certain Cabinet officers and members of industry and representatives of the consuming public to protect our economy after this war is over. One of the most important things to keep in mind is that we can destroy the very Government we are fighting today to preserve by dumping these enormous surpluses without proper safeguards.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is it the gentleman's idea that you are creating here the machinery that will control the drop in prices, so that prices will not go clear down?

Mr. MANASCO. It would be humanly impossible to pass any legislation that would safeguard every situation, but we are trying to have a general control that will protect the consuming public as well as the taxpayers and the Government.

Mr. COFFEE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. COFFEE. Is anything done in this bill to extend the purview of the bill to the Alien Property Custodian?

Mr. MANASCO. The Alien Property Custodian, as I understand, will probably not be covered by the provisions of this bill.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. This bill covers only the property owned by the United States. The property of the Alien Property Custodian is not owned by the United States but is held in trust by him. It is not embraced in the terms of this bill.

Mr. COFFEE. I did not think that was strictly under the supervision of the committee or came within its jurisdiction.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It is not within the terms of this bill.

Mr. COFFEE. I recall that at the end of the last war there was a scandal of about \$1,500,000,000 very badly handled by the then Alien Property Custodian. I do not want to see a repetition of it. I am advised there will be seven billions of alien property sequestered by us in this war. We must be vigilant that it be administered with scrupulous honesty and fairness.

Mr. RABAUT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANASCO. Yes.

Mr. RABAUT. I commend the gentleman for the very fine statement he has made to the House about the bill.

Mr. MANASCO. I thank the gentleman. It may be advisable for the Government to sell some of the surplus property to the manufacturer. This procedure would enable the manufacturer to stay in business after the war, and not be consumed with the fear of having no property to sell or anything of that kind. And when this manufacturer does not have enough cash to acquire the surplus

material, it might be to the best interest of our country to extend long-term credit.

Mr. Chairman, I think this question is one of the most serious questions affecting us at the present time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I want to say in behalf of the Members upon my side of the aisle that all but one of the Members were practically present at all of the hearings. The one Member to whom I refer was unavoidably absent, being engaged on another important committee. I presume that the other side of the House might have occasion to state the same reason for any of their absentees. But I may say that the Republicans were at practically all of the committee hearings. I say that in justice to these new Members. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE], who was so attentive, has spoken today. Permit me to talk a little about one of the gentlemen from Pennsylvania [Mr. GILLETTE], a modest member of that committee, who attended to his duties faithfully. I often find myself that I can entertain best by listening. He listened, and I think it is due him to have that statement made, because he has not, as a new Member, taken any part in the discussion today, which, of course, he could do if he wished.

Mr. GRAHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM. Speaking for the Pennsylvania delegation, I assure the gentleman from Massachusetts, that we very much appreciate his expression in respect to our colleague [Mr. GILLETTE]. He is all that the gentleman has described, modest, retiring, but we have found him to be one of the solid, substantial Members of our delegation, who always contributes something worth while.

Mr. GIFFORD. In politics modesty, of course, is always timely. I have not been very modest myself, but still it is a virtue that I greatly admire.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Yes.

Mr. VORYS of Ohio. The gentleman, in spite of all of his words, is usually modest. In discussing the work of this committee, he has not given to the public the information that I have received in private from his colleagues, and that is respecting the distinguished and painstaking work that the gentleman from Massachusetts, the ranking member of the committee, has contributed to this difficult subject.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I always give painstaking work, and in fact my work often inflicts pain. The gentleman from California said that I am sometimes sarcastic. As an old high-school teacher I might suggest that there is not a word of sarcasm in all of these hearings. There may be some ironical statements, but they are vastly different. I think you should agree with that. Perhaps I may well continue with this explanation. I will do so but agree to delete it from the Record. At least it may be entertaining and I may hope profitable.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 minutes. I did not want to consume too much time in my presentation in chief. For that reason I probably did not answer some of the inquiries as fully as I would like. I take this time now to answer some questions that were propounded during the debate, and some questions that have been asked privately during the progress of the debate on the floor. The question was asked whether the Commodity Credit Corporation would come under the terms of this bill. For two reasons it would not. It would not in the first place, under the definition of surplus property. That corporation would be organized for disposing of surplus property, and that is its function. That would be outside of the definition of surplus property. In the next place in all property of any corporation, including the Commodity Credit or any other corporation organized under the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, only administrative property, like desks, typewriters, and so forth is within the terms of the bill.

A question was asked by the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] to which I wanted to respond more at length, whether or not in the event the rental exceeded the cost of repairs, the excess would be covered in the general funds of the Treasury. I might have said to him as I now say that the rental would not only cover the repairs, but would cover maintenance, operation, depreciation and management, but the information of the committee generally was that that would be less than the rental, but remembering that members of the committee want to protect that one thing among others, this committee stood for turning the money back into the Treasury, as miscellaneous receipts. We will offer an amendment to make that provision more definite.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield, I would like to express my appreciation of what he has said.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. The gentleman from Iowa has asked about the disposition of lumber not used. Under section 260 of this bill, if there is any property anywhere at any time such as that embraced in the so-called Lanham act, which we passed in the House—it has never passed the other body—any lumber or cement or any material on any project where the construction has been stopped, that can be made available to the Government without purchase or reduplicating. I have already made answer to the inquiry respecting the Alien Property Custodian. That property is in trust and it is not within the terms of this act.

Mr. Chairman, someone rather questioned the wisdom of this committee and the investigation with respect to land. As already has been stated during this debate, the millions and hundreds of millions of dollars invested in lands for war purposes is an important matter.

This special committee which we have recommended the Congress to appoint will not be a roving committee. It will not be a committee to hold hearings or conduct junkets throughout the country. There is only \$10,000 available to that

proposed committee. That will be a working committee. When we send down to one department after the other in an effort to find out how many acres of land, how many hotels, how many buildings there are and have one department say they do not know and that the other department does, we authorize a subpoena here to give the special committee that definite information. In other words, if there is one thing we want to know about and with millions and millions of dollars invested in it, it is real property as well as all other types of property. It is not contemplated that there will be a delay until after the war before legislation is passed for the disposition of surplus war materials or property. That committee may make interim reports. Whenever legislation is needed at any time it should be reported by the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, by the Committee on Expenditures or any other committee having jurisdiction, but the final report of the special committee must be submitted in 6 months. This resolution gives that committee power to subpoena and power to appoint an investigator and it protects the Treasury.

May I say in conclusion that I have had some experience with investigating committees. I believe I have a unique record of having been chairman of two successive committees in two Congresses, that did a great deal of work and did not spend a cent of money that was appropriated to them.

Mr. MURDOCK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. MURDOCK. There were two questions I wanted to ask. Does the bill contain anything pertaining to the war minerals and metals deposits which the Government has supplied which may be surplus?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. During the progress of the hearings it developed that any such minerals are owned by corporations. They are not within the terms of this bill. They will have to be disposed of by subsequent legislation or by their charters.

Mr. MURDOCK. Secondly, with regard to land where the Government has used its own public domain for bombing purposes, or war training, and that sort of thing, has there been any arrangement made about the restoration of such land to its original uses and users?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Lands, buildings, or other appurtenant facilities or fixtures are expressly reserved for further legislation and are not included in the terms of this bill. The pressing necessity for this bill is the discontinuance of W. P. A., with about \$20,000,000 worth of property; the property of the N. Y. A. now piled up; and the Director of the Budget and the Assistant Secretary of War say they are eliminating 50,000 or 60,000 employees, and that will eliminate administrative property that ought to be disposed of.

Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The Members will notice that the first section of this bill goes to the middle of page 15. Inasmuch as the bill has been

analyzed section by section, I take the liberty, after conferring with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD], of asking unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be dispensed with and that it be printed in the Record at this point and that amendments to any section of the bill be in order at this time.

Mr. GIFFORD. As far as that is concerned, I hope there will be no objection to the request.

Mr. LANHAM. Reserving the right to object, and I do not intend to object, I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry, whether or not any amendment is pending at the Clerk's desk?

Mr. GIFFORD. I understand that any amendment can be offered to any portion of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the unanimous-consent request amendments would be in order to any part of the bill.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921 (42 Stat. 20), is amended by inserting at the end of title II thereof (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 31, secs. 11 to 24, inclusive) the following:

"TITLE II—UTILIZATION AND DISPOSITION OF PROPERTY

"SEC. 251. As used in this title the term—

"(a) 'Agency' means any executive department, independent commission, board, bureau, office, agency, or other establishment of the Government, including any independent regulatory commission or board and any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, but does not include the legislative branch of the Government, the Supreme Court of the United States, or the municipal government of the District of Columbia.

"(b) 'Administrative unit' means any bureau, office, or similar administrative unit within any agency.

"(c) 'Property' means any supplies, materials, or equipment or any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States, but does not include any land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures or any gold or silver.

"(d) 'Surplus property' means any property which, pursuant to this title, is determined to be surplus to the function, activity, or project in connection with which it was acquired or accrued.

"(e) 'Director' means the Director of the Bureau of the Budget.

"(f) 'Procurement Division' means the Procurement Division in the Department of the Treasury.

"(g) 'Tax-supported organization' means any unit or instrumentality of government, or any scientific, literary, educational, or public health or welfare organization, which is supported in whole or in part through the use of funds derived from taxation by—

"(1) The United States or the District of Columbia;

"(2) Any Territory or possession of the United States or any subdivision of any such Territory or possession; or

"(3) Any State or any subdivision thereof; but such term does not include any agency (as defined in par. (a)).

"Sec. 252. In order to carry out the purposes of this title—

"(a) The head of each agency shall (1) establish and currently maintain, in such form as the Director may approve, an inventory of such classes or items of property in the possession or under the control of the agency, as the Director may designate; (2) submit to

the Director such estimates of property needed, and such reports in relation thereto, as the Director may deem necessary; and (3) at the close of each fiscal year submit to the Director such report as he may require of all transfers and dispositions of property under this title (excluding sec. 263) during such fiscal year and of the disposal of the proceeds.

"(b) The Director shall (1) periodically survey property in the possession or under the control of each agency and the utilization thereof, (2) establish appropriate standards for the stocking and utilization of property, (3) require the fullest practicable utilization of surplus property by agencies in order to avoid unnecessary commercial purchases, and (4) submit to the Congress as soon as practicable after the close of each fiscal year a consolidated report of all operations under this title.

"Sec. 253. (a) No agency or administrative unit shall transfer or sell, donate, destroy, or otherwise dispose of surplus property in the possession or under the control of such agency or administrative unit except as provided in this title or in any provision of law referred to in section 263.

"(b) In the case of any corporation owned or controlled by the United States the provisions of this title shall apply only in respect of materials, supplies, and equipment held or used by such corporation for administrative purposes.

"Sec. 254. (a) Whenever an administrative unit of an agency is responsible for the expenditure of more than one appropriation, allocation, or fund, the head of such agency may transfer any usable or repairable property from the service of one such appropriation, allocation, or fund to the service of another such appropriation, allocation, or fund upon (1) his determination that such property is surplus to the needs of the one and is needed for the purposes of the other, (2) his appraisal of the value of the property to be so transferred, and (3) payment of such appraised value from the receiving appropriation, allocation, or fund and disposal of the proceeds in accordance with the provisions of section 258.

"(b) Whenever an agency has established and is maintaining, at a standard acceptable to the Director, administrative controls over property under an office or employee designated for the purpose, the head of such agency may transfer any usable or repairable property from one administrative unit of the agency to another such unit upon compliance with clauses (1), (2), and (3) of subsection (a) of this section.

"Sec. 255. Any agency may sell (1) any property which is damaged or worn beyond economical repair; (2) any waste, salvage, scrap, or other comparable items; or (3) any products of industrial, research, agricultural, or livestock operations or of any public works construction or maintenance project carried on by such agency. If any such property is of no commercial value or if the cost of sale thereof would exceed the estimated proceeds, it may be donated to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions. Any such property which is not practically saleable and cannot be beneficially utilized by donation to any tax-supported organization or any eleemosynary institution shall be destroyed or otherwise disposed of. The sale, donation, destruction, or other disposition of any property under this section shall be subject to such regulations as the President may prescribe.

"Sec. 256. (a) Whenever the President or the head of any agency determines that any usable or repairable property under the control or in the possession of the agency is surplus to the needs of such agency or any administrative unit thereof in the performance of any functions, activities, or projects in connection with which the property was acquired or accrued, the President or the head of the agency, as the case may be, shall, unless such property is transferred under

section 254, or is disposed of under section 255, declare such property to the Procurement Division as surplus.

"(b) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under subsection (a) which is needed by any of the agencies or administrative units in the prosecution of their functions, activities, or projects shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be transferred (or be held in storage pending transfer) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division to such agencies or administrative units as may be designated by the Director at values fixed by the Procurement Division.

"(c) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under subsection (a) which the Director determines is not needed by any of the agencies or administrative units in the prosecution of their functions, activities, or projects shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be sold or leased (or be held in storage pending sale or lease) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division to tax-supported organizations at prices or rates fixed by the Procurement Division.

"(d) Transfers, sales, and leases of property under subsections (b) and (c) of this section shall be pursuant to such regulations as the President may prescribe.

"Sec. 257. (a) Any property declared to the Procurement Division as surplus under section 256 (a) which cannot practically be disposed of under section 256 (b) or (c) shall be repaired or rehabilitated as found necessary and economical and be disposed of (or be held in storage pending disposition) by or under the direction of the Procurement Division as follows:

"(1) By sale or lease in the domestic market.

"(2) By sale or lease to agencies of foreign governments.

"(3) By sale or lease in foreign markets, but only if such property cannot practically be disposed of under paragraph (2).

"(4) By donation to tax-supported organizations or eleemosynary institutions, by destruction, or by such other method as is determined to be feasible; but property shall be disposed of under this paragraph only if it cannot practically be disposed of by sale or lease under any of the preceding paragraphs.

"(b) The sale, lease, donation, destruction, or other disposition of property under this section shall be in accordance with regulations prescribed by the President. The regulations prescribed under this subsection which relate to the sale or lease of property shall include provisions requiring publication of the times, places, quantities, and terms and conditions of the proposed dispositions of such property, and requiring advertising for competitive bids except in such cases and with respect to such property as the President determines that sales or leases by competitive bids would be contrary to the public interest.

"Sec. 258. Where property transferred or disposed of under any provisions of this title except section 259 has been acquired by the use of funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury and such appropriated funds are not by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue, all proceeds derived from the transfer or sale, lease, or other disposition thereof shall be deposited and covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts. Where property transferred or disposed of under any provisions of this title except section 259 has been acquired by the use of funds other than those appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury or by the use of funds appropriated from the general fund of the Treasury which are by law reimbursable from assessment, tax, or other revenue, all expenses incurred in respect of such transfer or disposition shall be deducted from the

proceeds (if any), the funds bearing such expenses reimbursed in like amount, and the balance of the proceeds (if any) credited to the reimbursable fund or appropriation or paid to the agency releasing the property. This section shall not apply to the sale with the approval of a duly authorized representative of the agency concerned of any property in the custody of a contractor or subcontractor under a cost-plus-a-fixed-fee contract or subcontract which authorizes the crediting of the proceeds of such sale on the cost of the work described in such contract or subcontract.

"Sec. 259. Whenever the Director shall determine it to be efficient or economical, he may designate specific classes of equipment in the possession or control of various agencies and administrative units which may be made available for full use for definite periods of time by other agencies or administrative units or for the prosecution of functions, activities, or projects other than those for which said equipment was acquired within an agency or administrative unit, at a rental rate based on a schedule promulgated by the Director. The rental schedule shall be based on the actual or estimated cost of operation, repair, maintenance, depreciation, and equipment management control. Such use of equipment shall be with the consent of the agency having possession or control thereof and only in connection with a function, activity, or project for which an appropriation, allocation, or fund for the rental, repair, maintenance, and operation of such equipment is available. All proceeds from the rental of equipment under this section shall be credited to the current appropriation, allocation, or fund available to the rentor agency or administrative unit for operation, maintenance, repair, or replacement of the equipment, or in the absence of such an appropriation, allocation, or fund, shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

"Sec. 260. When the United States is in a state of war, and upon determination by the President that any equipment, materials, or supplies devoted to a particular use are urgently needed by some nongovernmental agency in connection with the prosecution of the war, are not subject to disposition as surplus, and cannot otherwise be obtained by such nongovernmental agency, the President may authorize or direct the head of the agency having control thereof, in order to fulfill such need, to sell to nongovernmental agencies such equipment, materials, or supplies for cash at a price not less than the appraised value thereof, or to lease or rent such property at commercial rates or such other rates as will fully compensate the Government.

"Sec. 261. All powers vested in the President or in the head of an agency by this title may be exercised by a representative or representatives designated for the purpose and the President may utilize the services and facilities of any agency in effectuating the purposes of this title.

"Sec. 262. Nothing in this title shall be construed as modifying any of the provisions of title III of this act.

"Sec. 263. (a) The provisions of this title shall not modify or in any way affect the following provisions of law:

"(1) Section 5 of the act approved March 3, 1883 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 492), authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to sell vessels stricken from the Navy register;

"(2) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1905, and for other purposes,' approved April 23, 1904 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 50, sec. 65), as reads:

"The Secretary of War is hereby authorized to sell to American designers such serviceable ordnance and ordnance stores as may be necessary in the development of designs which may be used in the military service:

Provided, That such ordnance and ordnance stores can be spared for the purpose, and funds arising from such sales shall be available to replace like ordnance and ordnance stores;

"(3) The act entitled 'An act to permit sales by the supply departments of the Army to certain military schools and colleges,' approved July 17, 1914 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1179);

"(4) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes,' approved August 29, 1916 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 493), as reads:

"The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to sell any or all of the auxiliary ships of the Navy classified as colliers, transports, tenders, supply ships, special types, and hospital ships, which are 18 years and over in age, which he deems unsuited to present needs of the Navy and which can be disposed of at an advantageous price, which shall not be less than 50 percent of their original cost, the money obtained from such sale to be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts;

"(5) So much of the act entitled 'An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes,' approved July 11, 1919 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1274), as reads:

"The interchange without compensation therefor, of military stores, supplies, and equipment of every character, including real estate owned by the Government, is hereby authorized between the Army and Navy upon the request of the head of one service and with the approval of the head of the other service.

"(6) The Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 46, sec. 1101 and following);

"(7) The act entitled 'An act to authorize the Secretary of War to sell, loan, or give samples of supplies and equipment to prospective manufacturers,' approved July 27, 1937 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 10, sec. 1192a);

"(8) The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution to authorize the Secretaries of War and of the Navy to assist the governments of American republics to increase their military and naval establishments, and for other purposes,' approved June 15, 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 22, secs. 521 to 527, inclusive);

"(9) The act entitled 'An act authorizing the sale of fuel, electric current, ice, and water at isolated naval stations,' approved June 13, 1940 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 34, sec. 553);

"(10) The act entitled 'An act to expedite the strength of the national defense,' approved July 2, 1940 (Public Law 703, 76th Cong., U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 41, set forth in note preceding sec. 1);

"(11) The joint resolution entitled 'Joint resolution making an appropriation to the United States Maritime Commission for emergency cargo ship construction, and for other purposes,' approved February 6, 1941 (Public Law 5, 77th Cong.);

"(12) Title III (caption "United States Maritime Commission") of the act entitled 'An act making supplemental appropriations for the national defense for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1942, and for other purposes,' approved August 25, 1941 (Public Law 247, 77th Cong.);

"(13) The act entitled 'An act further to promote the defense of the United States, and for other purposes,' approved March 11, 1941, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. I, title 22, secs. 411-422, inclusive);

"(14) The First War Powers Act, 1941 (U. S. C., 1940 ed., Supp. I, title 50, appendix, secs. 601 to 622, inclusive);

"(15) The Second War Powers Act, 1942 (Public Law 507, 77th Cong.; 56 Stat. 176);

"(16) The act entitled 'An act to authorize the return to private ownership of certain

vessels formerly used or suitable for use in the fisheries or industries related thereto,' approved April 29, 1943 (Public Law 44, 78th Cong.).

"(b) Except as provided in subsection (a), all laws or parts of laws governing the disposition of surplus property or the disposal of proceeds therefrom are modified and superseded to the extent of any conflict with the provisions of this title."

SEC. 2. During the continuance of the present war and for 6 months after the termination of the war, or until such earlier time as the Congress by concurrent resolution or the President may designate, sections 252, 253, 254, 256, or 260 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act, shall not apply, except in the discretion of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, the Chairman of the United States Maritime Commission, or the Administrator of the War Shipping Administration, as the case may be, to any property in the possession or under the control of the War Department, the Department of the Navy, the United States Maritime Commission, the War Shipping Administration, or any administrative unit (as defined in sec. 251 of such act, as amended) of either such Department, Commission, or Administration which (1) was acquired from funds made available by appropriation or otherwise for military purposes, or (2) is being held or utilized for military purposes.

SEC. 3. (a) After the date on which the President proclaims that the hostilities of the present war have ceased, no war materials shall be disposed of under section 256 (c) or 257 of title II-A of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended, except as may be provided by law enacted after the date of enactment of this act.

(b) As used in this section and in section 4 "war materials" means any tangible property owned by the United States or by any corporation owned or controlled by the United States which was acquired or is held or utilized for military purposes, but does not include any land, buildings, or their appurtenant facilities or fixtures or any gold or silver.

SEC. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus War Property Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection was made. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to undertake promptly a full and complete study and investigation of the types, quantities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes, which may reasonably be expected to be in the possession or under the control of any agency (as defined in sec. 251 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act) at the time of cessation of hostilities in the present war, and no longer needed for such purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, the results of its study, together with its recommendations as to any necessary additional legislation and administrative action to insure the orderly disposition of such property. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. The committee shall make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

(c) The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to

hold such hearings, to sit and act at such times and places, to employ such experts and such clerical and other assistants, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer such oaths, to take such testimony, and to make such expenditures, as it deems advisable. The provisions of sections 102 to 104, inclusive, of the Revised Statutes, as amended (U. S. C., 1940 ed., title 2, secs. 192-194, inclusive), shall apply in case of any failure of any witness to comply with any subpoena, or to testify when summoned under the authority of this section.

(d) The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Government.

(e) All authority conferred in this section shall terminate upon submission of the committee's final report.

(f) The expenses of the committee, not to exceed \$10,000, shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives, upon vouchers signed by the chairman.

SEC. 5. There are authorized to be appropriated such sums as may be necessary or appropriate to carry out the purposes of this act and the purposes of title II-A of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act.

SEC. 6. This act may be cited as the "Surplus Personal Property Act of 1943."

MR. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WHITTINGTON: Insert at the end of line 19, page 10, after striking out the period and inserting a colon, the following: "Provided, That all transactions under this section shall be reported at least quarterly to the Director, and whenever the proceeds so reported are found by him to exceed the amounts necessary for the repair, maintenance, and management of the equipment rented, such excess proceeds shall be covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts."

MR. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, in support of that amendment I will simply say it is offered after conferring with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] and Members on both sides, in response to the suggestion to make certain that the views of the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] are embraced in the bill.

THE CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

MR. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, which is at the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows.

Amendment offered by Mr. CHURCH: On page 16, line 21, strike out all of section 4.

MR. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I do not expect to take much of the time of the committee on this amendment. In my main statement awhile ago I called attention to the fact that I was very much in favor of this bill. At the same time I am opposed to section 4 remaining in the bill. Section 4 will take from our Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments its duties, the work it has been doing and should do for the next several months.

MR. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CHURCH. I gladly yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment the creation of this committee would slow up or at least retard a part of the proper investigation of the various matters to which the section pertains.

The Military Affairs Committee would naturally be more familiar with the situation as it affects the War Department; the Naval Affairs Committee with reference to the Navy Department; the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee with reference to the lands for war housing, and so forth. Such investigations as should be carried on could very well be under the jurisdiction and the supervision of the various legislative committees. This section would require the creation of an entirely new committee to embrace the whole field, and to do the particular work that the various legislative committees are supposed to do.

There has been a tendency, I think through the years and perhaps accentuated somewhat in recent years, to emasculate the legislative committees of this House who should have primary consideration of the things that pertain to their respective jurisdictions.

Mr. CHURCH. I agree with the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, it is very difficult for me to support this amendment or to oppose it. I do not care, particularly. There is really nothing in what I read this morning to the House in reciting the duties of this particular committee that would seem to me, after all, to warrant the expectation that this committee would be selected to deal with surplus property after the war is over. I well understand how the committees feel about encroaching on their powers and duties. I had thought perhaps it would be better to have a joint committee created. Sometimes it results in better feeling between the two bodies, and it is more likely to bring results. I served for a year and a half on the joint committee dealing with the reorganization of the Government. Of course, the other body usually tries to show they are more able than the House Members, but usually we manage to get along. But you remember these differences we have had on the floor of the House and sometimes I have thought it might be the better practice if we had a joint committee to go into these things in the first instance.

If we have this joint committee, my committee might be supposed to be recognized and I being the ranking member naturally might expect to be appointed on that committee; or I might step aside in the hope that my distinguished friend from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], who loves the work, might be selected. But because there might be some possible honor attached to it, or because there might be some work involved, I might not feel at liberty to dodge it even for the purpose of having my friend on it.

Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to talk on both sides of the question. I did that on the Ruml plan, but I think you fully understood my motive and reason. It was the question of taking the lesser of two evils. In this case I do not know

about even the lesser of the evils. I frankly say that if the amendment offered in committee by the gentleman from California [Mr. MANASCO] is presented to the House, it seems to me it should receive real attention because it embodies the problem of surplus after the war is over.

What we have done is the usual old method, and I have seen it for the 28 years of my legislative experience, that when a vital matter arises and there is too sudden demand for action a committee is appointed to look into it, largely to delay action.

Mr. Chairman, you have listened to my statement. I absolve every Member on this side, and any member of the committee for voting any way he wishes on the amendment, as I will make no recommendation.

If I find it necessary to vote, I shall vote to create the joint committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

I have a high regard for the views of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]. I understand the attitude of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH], but my thought is they have both misconstrued the amendment and the provisions of section 4. Section 4 is not intended to supplant or to supersede any committee of the House. This section has to do with surplus war materials, and as a member of the committee, I conferred with representatives of industry, agriculture, and manufacturing, who approved the special committee, not for the purpose of passing legislation but for the purpose, as stated in section 4, and at this time it is proper for me to read:

Sec. 4. (a) There is hereby established a Surplus War Property Committee (hereinafter referred to as the "committee") to be composed of five Members of the Senate, to be appointed by the President of the Senate, and five Members of the House of Representatives, to be appointed by the Speaker. A vacancy in the committee shall be filled in the same manner as the original selection was made. The committee shall elect a chairman from among its members.

(b) It shall be the duty of the committee to undertake promptly a full and complete study and investigation of the types, quantities, values, location, and custody of war materials and other tangible property, both real and personal, acquired, held, or utilized for military purposes, which may reasonably be expected to be in the possession or under the control of any agency (as defined in sec. 251 of the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, as amended by this act) at the time of cessation of hostilities in the present war, and no longer needed for such purposes. The committee shall report to the Senate and the House of Representatives at the earliest practicable date, but not later than 6 months after the date of enactment of this act, the results of its study, together with its recommendations as to any necessary additional legislation and administrative action to insure the orderly disposition of such property. If the Senate, the House of Representatives, or both, are in recess or have adjourned the report shall be made to the Secretary of the Senate, the Clerk of the House of Representatives, or both, as the case may be. The committee shall make such interim reports as it deems advisable.

This committee would have the power, and the only funds provided are \$10,000

to employ an investigator, to subpoena witnesses, to bring in books and documents; it would have the power and the authority to do substantially what the Byrd committee is now doing, furnish information and submit recommendations and facts that can be utilized by the various committees of the House and Senate.

It is my thought that the information furnished by this committee, composed of able men as the Vice President and the Speaker shall appoint from the two Houses of the Congress, can submit information that should be of benefit to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, to the Military Affairs Committee, to the Naval Affairs Committee, to the Committee on Expenditures, and other committees having jurisdiction of the subject matter. I assume that that information transmitted to Congress would be referred by the Speaker to the appropriate committees of Congress; so I insist that the purpose of this section is to ascertain facts and make recommendations. Frankly I do not know how the gentleman from Texas has succeeded but I will say to the gentleman that I know he is doing his best with respect to lands and buildings. At least one member of his committee has come to our committee and asked what information we had been able to obtain as to the lands and buildings that the Government has acquired for war purposes. Thus far we have not been able to get full information; neither has the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, as I am advised, but if this committee were appointed it would have the power to appoint an investigator and to do what the chairman of the other committees cannot do, order those in the various departments to furnish us the factual information, by subpoena, to compel production of full information. So it is my thought, Mr. Chairman, that the most constructive feature of this bill is section 4. It is to furnish the Congress for the use of its committees facts with respect to the various kinds of property. We made this recommendation after giving this matter consideration from January until May and after we had had the views of business, agricultural, manufacturing, and mercantile spokesmen of the country.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. May I ask the gentleman if it is not true that these various departments and agencies of the Government should know what materials they have and what is surplus? And can they not give that information to committees of the House as well as to another specially appointed committee of the House? And may they not also give that information to the Bureau of the Budget as provided in this measure, and

that the Bureau of the Budget knowing the requirements of the various agencies could declare what part of that available material was surplus?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I will answer the gentleman's question by saying that they have the right to do that now, but as the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HALE] said, having that right they have not done it; and the gentleman from Maine said, in response to the question of the gentleman from Texas, that as a new Member of this body he was absolutely astounded that the Congress of the United States had not passed this legislation 100 years ago, or to use his language, in 1815; in other words, we have depended upon these agencies to declare whether or not they had any surplus property and if we continue to depend upon these agencies to declare their surplus property we shall continue to be without that information.

Mr. LANHAM. In my judgment, the remainder of the bill makes proper provision to get that information without employing, at great expense, which in my judgment will far exceed the \$10,000, an additional committee.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. We went into that very carefully and we limited it very specifically to \$10,000, so the Treasury would be protected. We followed the language of the Byrd committee. I do not know, and neither does the gentleman from Texas nor any other Member of Congress, any better source of suggestions than the business, mercantile, and industrial agencies of the country in dealing with a matter involving \$50,000,000,000. Chambers of commerce and other business and industrial institutions of the country say: "Give us an opportunity to be heard before passing legislation to dispose of surplus war materials."

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 additional minute to answer the gentleman's question.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Mr. Chairman, directing attention to lines 17 to 19 on page 17 of the bill which provides that this committee shall make its recommendations to insure the orderly disposition of such property, I want to know if this committee has the power to try to work out a way whereby they can get a profitable disposition of this property? This deals only with the mechanics of disposition; I want to know how it will save money for the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me say that the purpose of this committee is to make studies and recommendations for legislation to prevent dumping \$50,000,000,000 or \$5,000,000,000 or \$10,000,000,000 of property at any one time. This committee will give us the benefit of its recommendations as to the orderly disposition of that property, because it would be absolutely ruinous to the econ-

omy of the country if we were to dump say 150,000 trucks, or 150,000 airplanes, or 5,000,000 pairs of shoes at one time. To prevent that is the very purpose of this bill.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is it the gentleman's opinion that this is broad enough to give them that power? Does this go beyond the mere matter of mechanics?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not only will they make recommendations, but various committees of Congress will have those recommendations, have the right to consider them, and we will get the benefit not only of the views of this committee but of the constituted committees of this House who may submit legislation to the Congress.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield.

Mr. CHURCH. Will the gentleman refer to subsection (b) on page 17 which the gentleman just interrogated him about? I wish to get his opinion. This committee we are going to appoint has to report promptly, proceed promptly. It is going to consider all of this property and insure the orderly disposition of such property. How can that committee do that with any force or effect without taking from the regularly constituted committees of the House and Senate the same problem of considering this matter of surplus or the expenditures in the executive branch of the Government?

Mr. LANHAM. I agree with the gentleman and I called attention to that earlier in the debate.

Mr. Chairman, I wish to make reference now to another matter. Allusion has been made to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds. May I say with respect to that committee that several years ago with reference to the surplus real estate of the United States Government we did pass a law governing its disposition. This measure comes belatedly in the track of the action of the Public Buildings and Grounds Committee with reference to Government-owned real estate. This provides, however, for personal property, though this particular section places the obligation upon the new committee to look also into real estate.

We have some plants of the Army and Navy of this country that are carrying on secret operations. There is a bill pending before the Judiciary Committee with reference to the protection of those secret processes and operations involving personal and real property. I have familiarized myself somewhat with the purpose of that proposed legislation. In order to maintain that secrecy which is necessary for the proper promotion of our war efforts we should not have these over-all committees going around trying to tell the Naval Affairs Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and the other committees, just how they should conduct their committee operations. I think it ill becomes any of us serving in

this House to be criticizing one another in the service that we render through our respective committees. We all take the same obligation; we are all working very diligently in an effort to perform our duties; and I think to have this over-all committee as landlord and overseer for the various legislative committees which know these particular matters, and can best get the information with reference to them, is a mistake.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Am I correct in the assumption, then, that the gentleman thinks the Committee on Expenditures in Executive Departments does have all the necessary authority now?

Mr. LANHAM. Although I have not looked into the question lately, I understand that in Great Britain that is one of the most important committees in their whole parliamentary system, and it has been my understanding that the purpose of this committee is to follow up these expenditures that are made in the executive departments to know what is done with the money and what is done with what the money buys.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am glad to hear that because I have been on that committee now for 6 or 8 years, along with the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]. We have been wanting to do a little something, but that committee has functioned something like the Labor Committee. We have long recesses, and when we do meet we talk a little bit. If the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] could assure us that some time before we are all dead we will have an opportunity to function and look into these things, it would be encouraging. It would induce a man to try to live longer and to try to serve his country a little.

Mr. LANHAM. Let me propound this inquiry: How can a committee of Members of the House, or of the two bodies, take into their hands the respective labors of all these various legislative committees that have to do with these various questions and do the whole job better than these committees can do their respective parts of it?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 additional minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. LANHAM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANHAM. Mr. Chairman, these various agencies of the Government certainly have the information as to the personal property that they have within their respective organizations and I believe that the committees that have the legislative charge of those various agencies are in a better position from their experience and from their knowledge of the operations of those agencies to get this information from them than one big central, overlord, supervising committee could possibly be.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LANHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I do not know whether I understood the gentleman correctly, but did I understand him to say that there is now on the statute books legislation authorizing the War Department to dispose of the hotels and land owned by the War Department?

Mr. LANHAM. No. The gentleman is begging the question.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I am not begging the question.

Mr. LANHAM. I said that insofar as the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds was concerned, prior to this war we passed legislation which is now on the statute books and which does give authority to dispose of the surplus real estate of the Government.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. In certain instances it does, but in all fairness and in order to keep the record straight, is it not necessary for this Congress to pass a bill to authorize them to dispose of land? You have to pass a special act of Congress in that sort of case and this bill here deals with war materials not embraced in any legislation heretofore passed.

Mr. LANHAM. I understood the gentleman to say earlier in the debate that this bill had nothing to do with real estate and fixtures on real estate. Now he begins to talk about land, dams, and buildings. We are going to get confusion worse confounded by having this kind of committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HARE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

Mr. Chairman, I do not know that I am thoroughly familiar with the purpose of this proposal. It has been suggested that the committee proposed herein would interfere with the rights of legislative committees in a proper disposition of materials and supplies in the hands of the Government agencies.

I can understand why one of the major committees probably would be better qualified and better fitted by reason of experience to dispose of any surplus property, but we forget that we have a number of agencies in the Government created by Executive orders that do not come under the supervision or direction of any legislative committee. Who is going to take charge of the surplus property there?

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will yield for a correction, that is exactly the purpose of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments. That is exactly its jurisdiction.

Mr. HARE. If the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments has absolute authority, absolute right, absolute jurisdiction over all of this property, to see where it is, to make inventory of it, and dispose of it, then I think this duty ought to be discharged by that committee, and the proposed committee would then be unnecessary; otherwise there should be some committee charged with such responsibility, and

it is my understanding the proposed committee is to be charged with such responsibility. If I am mistaken, I would like to be fully advised.

Mr. CHURCH. I do not want the gentleman to misunderstand me. I thought the gentleman was trying to point out that there is quite a bit of property that would not come under the jurisdiction of other committees. I want the gentleman to understand that this bill has to do with the control of expenditures in the executive departments, and therefore would take care of that property which I thought the gentleman was trying to say could not be taken care of.

Mr. HARE. No; I was referring to the legislative committees only and not to the powers and functions of the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments.

We had an experience this last year in liquidating the Civilian Conservation Corps. That was not under the supervision of any particular legislative committee, yet this agency, created by Executive order, had acquired several million dollars worth of material, supplies, and equipment. Who will dispose of that? The Committee on Appropriations said it should be offered to the War Department, the Navy Department, the Air Corps, and so forth. I think it was referred under the provisions of another statute to the Bureau of the Budget to dispose of it. The Bureau of the Budget kept title to it for a short time, and then said, "We do not know what to do with it, so we will transfer our right back to the War Department." There you are. No one knows exactly what disposition has been made of this material and equipment, although the Director of the C. C. C. has a full, complete, and detailed inventory of all of the surplus materials and equipment of the C. C. C.

The same is true of the National Youth Administration. We have surplus commodities, supplies, and materials there now, stored, on which rent is being paid, yet nobody seems to have the authority, right, or responsibility to dispose of it. There is not an appropriation bill that comes to the House but that has in it an item, year after year, asking for additional equipment. My thought is that if you had a central storehouse or a central inventory of all of this material you would be able to dispose of such equipment by transferring it to whatever agency could use it to the best advantage.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Let me say to the gentleman that there is nothing in this bill that would prevent the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds, the Committee on Naval Affairs, or the Committee on Military Affairs from bringing in a bill tomorrow morning, if the House would consider it, for the disposal of this property. I submit, as the gentleman says, in view of the fact that the gentleman from Texas says the various committees, including the Committee on the Judiciary, are considering this matter, that all of the information they can get, whether it be furnished by

a special committee or a general committee, would be of help.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. DONDERO. I notice in section 4 that the committee is to report within 6 months after this bill becomes effective. Then on page 18, in subsection (e), it is provided that all authority conferred in this section shall terminate upon submission of the committee's final report. Is this permanent legislation on a permanent committee, or will it terminate with the filing of the report by that committee?

Mr. HARE. I judge that the language speaks for itself. I think 6 months would not be sufficient time to make a proper inventory, classify the materials, equipment, and so forth, and suggest the best method for their use or disposal.

Mr. DONDERO. May I ask the chairman that question?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. It expires in 6 months.

Mr. DONDERO. It is not a permanent committee?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Not at all.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARE. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. CHURCH. Does not that in effect mean that at the next session of Congress we shall have to appoint another committee? The war will not be over then.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from South Carolina has expired.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHURCH].

The question was taken; and, on a division (demanded by Mr. CHURCH), there were—ayes 27, noes 31.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and twenty-nine Members are present, a quorum.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Chairman, I demand tellers.

Tellers were ordered, and the Chairman appointed as tellers Mr. CHURCH and Mr. WHITTINGTON.

The Committee again divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 37, noes 57.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. HOFFMAN: On page 16, line 8, after "President" insert "or Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, this amendment is, on page 16, line 8, after the word "President", to insert "or Congress by concurrent resolution."

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I have not had an opportunity to confer with other

members of the committee, but if it would be agreeable to the gentleman from Massachusetts, and unless some of my colleagues object, I see no objection to the gentleman's amendment. Frankly, I think it is in accord with the remainder of the bill. Personally, I am agreeable to it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am surprised but happy.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

There was no objection.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 5, line 24, after the word "agency", strike out the period and insert a semicolon and add the following: "Provided, however, That any such property which is suitable for agriculture or livestock operations shall be first offered for sale to farmers and livestock operators at the best bid or appraised value."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment so that when this property is sold, it will not be dumped as a lot and sold possibly to industrial groups, but so that the farmers and the livestock raisers will have an opportunity to bid upon it. At this time we need 129 percent of the 1940 implement purchases. The amount we have available now for the farmers is only 23 percent. By the end of this season we will have a total of 40 percent of available implements purchased in 1940, and as a matter of fact we need 129 percent.

Mr. MANASCO. The gentleman would not want to restrict the bill so that the Procurement Division would have to offer surplus tanks, airplanes, and so forth, to the farmers, before it could sell them to anyone else.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I think the farmer should have an opportunity before the four agencies.

Mr. MANASCO. But I think the gentleman should limit his amendment to farm implements and not force the Procurement Division to submit offers to farmers for airplanes, tanks, guns, and things like that.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Airplanes would not be usable for the farm.

Mr. MANASCO. But under the provisions of the amendment, they would have to offer everything.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. No; I said such articles as are suitable for agriculture.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. WHITE. I would like to give some information to my colleague. Speaking of tanks, these tractors are very valuable on the farms. The tractors are needed all over the country, particularly in the West for land clearing and road grading.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Chairman, I see no reason why this amendment should not be adopted and I trust the Members will vote for it. It is an amendment that will be for the best interest of the country, not just for the farmers.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. Does the gentleman contemplate that in the sale of the particular goods to which he refers, the bids shall be limited to a group or to a class of farmers?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I say that they shall first offer it to the farmers at the highest bid, or at the appraised value. I say that for this reason. The whole world is going to need food after the war.

Mr. MICHENER. I agree with the gentleman as to that, but who is going to determine whether the bidders qualify? If we are going to adopt an amendment like that, we should provide some method of determining the qualifications of the farmers. Who is going to say whether this man or that man is a bona fide bidder?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The rules and regulations in the bill will do that, because it allows the President to do that through the Procurement Division. I trust this amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I know the gentleman is interested in agriculture and in the farmers. All of us are interested in agricultural legislation, providing for the necessities of the farmers, but we just cannot give the farmer special consideration in every bill that comes along. In all kindness I can understand that in a bill 18 pages long it may be difficult. This is an amendment to section 255, and this section deals with waste property, damaged beyond repair, salvage and scrap, and any products that might arise from any of the agencies of the Government. We want to give the farmers help to raise food and we should give them something besides scrap. I can understand that the word "property" would mean plows, tractors, and hoes, but "products" means things that incidentally follow, that are in that category of waste, and this section provides that the President of the United States may establish regulations for the disposal of such waste products, and in order to protect them under section 257, if there is any property that is not waste that was not injured beyond repair and it has been rehabilitated, it must be sold in the domestic market, and the farmers will have an opportunity to acquire all the property that the farmers can use. Such an amendment as the gentleman has offered would not effectuate the gentleman's desire. The bill provides that if there are any surplus materials available to the farmer, he would have an opportunity to purchase them.

Mr. WHITE. What provision is there for disposing of surplus explosives?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. They are war materials generally to be disposed of after the war. We do not undertake to dispose of explosives in this bill unless they are surplus and then only with the consent of the Army and Navy. I ask that the amendment of the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM] be rejected.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. I yield.

Mr. J. LEROY JOHNSON. Is not the answer to the gentleman's amendment found in section (b), page 8, the first sentence?

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Yes, and, as I have stated, the amendment is wholly unnecessary and may hurt rather than help farmers.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. Chairman, I am directing my remarks particularly to the gentleman from Mississippi, the gentleman in charge of this bill. I want to say that if there was ever a scandalous condition that existed in this country it was in the disposition of surplus materials after the last war. I point out one instance of the disposal of our surplus explosives. This Congress passed a bill to make those explosives available free to the Bureau of Public Roads and to the farmers for clearing land and building roads. What happened? The du Ponts stepped in and got a \$7,000,000 contract at 7 cents a pound, if you please, for cartridge and boxing that material, when they used to sell Red Cross dynamite wholesale for less than 9 cents a pound. When I bought three different consignments of 1,000 pounds each of these surplus Government explosives to clear some stumps off of land in the State of Idaho I had to pay 7 cents a pound to the du Ponts and then pay the freight besides a handling charge of 2 cents before I could get these free explosives. This free powder cost me as much as if I had gone into the open market and bought it. I hope there will not be such a scandal in the disposition of surplus war materials after this war. We are still paying interest on the Liberty bonds sold 20 years ago in the last war to buy that powder, and it was a scandal.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As was stated in the beginning of the consideration of this bill, that material now, instead of being handled in a scandalous fashion, has to be disposed of to the several governmental agencies. If there is no governmental agency that can use it, then it is to be sold, but they get the first chance at it.

Mr. WHITE. I want to put this House and the country on notice of the scandals in the disposition of surplus materials after the last war. I think this bill is an attempt to prevent such scandals. I want the people to know what was done. Any man who bought surplus war material in these so-called Army stores has good reason to know what was done in the disposition of surplus material after the last war. I hope this Congress will have the good sense to pass legislation which will prevent such scandalous conditions occurring again.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Help me to understand the amendment. If we have any surplus left over of agricultural or livestock products, corn, oats,

or wheat owned by the Government, must we sell it back to the farmer who may have originally sold it, at a good price, at whatever he may be bid, so he can sell it to the consumer again? Or shall we let the consumer of the products have some advantage; let the poultryman have a chance? Shall not the dealer who might want to buy it to sell to the consumer have an equal opportunity? Under this amendment it seems that it must be first offered to the agricultural people before it can be offered to the dealer or the consumer. They may finally get the best bid possible and then say to the consumer, "You cannot purchase it." We could hardly expect bids other than from agricultural interests. I am a little confused about the procedure. How about these matters that are the products of research? Should they not also be offered back to the people who made the research in the first instance? I do not quite approve of this at the moment. You are trying to favor the farmer and, of course, I do not blame you. At the end of the section you have a provision that these products shall be sold according to the rules and regulations made by your President. I think your President would treat agricultural interests very fairly. But I am wondering if you are not trying to show favoritism to the agricultural and livestock people. Must the calves that the Government bought and has on hand be offered back to the farmer at his own price? Should not the consumer through his dealer have a chance to buy those calves?

I am a farmer and I can sympathize with the gentleman. I do not imagine I would profit under this, because I am but a small farmer. However, I have always found there are so-called gentleman farmers who have the cash to take advantage of such offers. I doubt if a poor farmer would have much of a chance to bid on necessarily large amounts that would have to be offered. I am trying to say that I think we are in a little danger when trying to particularize and help some particular classes of people in the method of disposal of property.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. Is the gentleman familiar with the provision in the agricultural bill, where loans have been made on wheat, that under the present law he is permitted to buy back the wheat or cotton that he has obtained a loan on?

Mr. GIFFORD. Two wrongs do not make another right with me. That precedent may be quoted, but this is a little different. You are trying to give a certain class a right over the consumer's equal demands. That is the point I am trying to make.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I would like to make this observation: That if the O. P. A. continues its regulations and price ceilings on agricultural products as they are doing at the present time, there will not be any surplus to dispose of in the near future.

Mr. GIFFORD. Oh, I think there will be a few extra cans of agricultural products on hand. Vast amounts are now in storage, pending possible military needs, and the military will probably not let these reserves dwindle much.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. HOFFMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment close in 5 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, my fisherman friend from Cape Cod does not seem today to have the same viewpoint as some of us on this proposition.

Many Members of this House from the agricultural States were visited last week by the canners of fruit and vegetables, who were down here in force, and there were very good reasons for their visit. Unless the canners are given relief, some of the citizens, like my good friend from Massachusetts, the majority leader, others in the cities, will be hungry next fall, next winter, and next spring, because, as one of the representatives in this group said, if they cannot get the cost of packing, if they cannot get the workers, the fruit and vegetables will not be put in cans. They are asking that they be permitted to raise wages 15 cents an hour in order to keep some of the men and women who are working in the canneries and who can and who will go into the defense industries in surrounding towns at higher wages.

A further request they are making is for a ceiling price. The O. P. A. induced the canners in California who are putting up asparagus to pay 15 cents an hour additional wage, with the assurance that the canners could add that extra cost to their price, which, added to the finished product, would raise the price to the consumer less than half a cent a can, but when the time came to fix a ceiling they did not get it.

Our canners are not going to be fooled; they are going to know whether or not when they pay that 15 cents an hour they will be allowed to include that additional cost in the finished-product price, and they want to know it before they get their products canned.

Our canners make contracts with the bean growers, the growers of strawberries, raspberries, cherries, in fact, with the growers of practically everything that goes into cans, for their season's crop. The farmers depend upon those contracts being made before they go into production, and the canners must know, before they make contracts with the growers, whether or not this Government intends to permit the charging of a ceiling price which will cover at least the cost of producing and putting the fruit and vegetables into the cans.

Our canners are not asking for a profit, but they do insist that, when they make every sacrifice demanded, they should

be permitted to charge a price which will at least insure their continued existence, their continued operation.

Just had a call from Michigan and was advised that the Associated Press and the United Press carried a statement that the Government had given permission to the canners to raise wages 15 cents per hour. Naturally, the employees wanted to know why the canners were not paying the 15 cents additional. The canners want to know why they are not permitted to pay the 15 cents per hour additional wage.

Last Saturday, at a meeting with Mr. Fred Vinson, Director of the Office of Economic Stabilization, we were advised by Mr. Vinson that the question of the increase in wages which the canners wanted to pay and the question of the determination of the ceiling price would be decided without further delay.

It is evident that the regional board in Michigan recommended the increase in wages, but that recommendation, as I was advised at 4 o'clock this afternoon, had not cleared the office of Chairman Vinson.

The canners, if they pay the additional 15 cents per hour, will be subject to prosecution by the Government.

It is conflicting situations like this which create confusion among those upon whose efforts our food supply for the next 2 years depends.

The difficulty now grows out of the fact that wages in war industries, which in the end, are paid by the Government from the Public Treasury, are far greater than the canners are permitted to pay. Public funds are being used to entice workers in essential food-processing industries away from their jobs.

Unless we can get relief—and that without delay—the fruit and the vegetables necessary to feed the armed forces, for the sustenance of the civilian population, will not go into cans this summer and fall.

These growers and these canners are not going to put their products into cans unless the confusion is ended, and this next winter there will be a shortage, and the folks in the city will be hungry. It will not bother those of us who are living in little towns because our wives and daughters and our relatives are growing and will can fruit and vegetables, and next fall we will have enough to eat, but the folks in the city will be hungry unless the administration quits its destructive interference with the canning industry.

The CHAIRMAN. All time for debate on this amendment is exhausted.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. As I understand, Mr. Chairman, the vote now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM]?

The CHAIRMAN. That is correct.

The question was taken, and the amendment was not agreed to.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. WICKERSHAM: On page 8, line 9, strike out the period, insert a semicolon and the following: "Provided, however, That any such property which is suitable for agriculture or livestock operations shall be first offered for sale to farmers and livestock operators at the best bid or the appraised value."

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I understand no further amendments are to be offered to the bill. I ask unanimous consent that all debate on this amendment and to the entire bill be limited to 20 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I am sincere in this amendment. The chairman of this committee pointed to the fact that the previous amendment applied to products raised by industrial research, agriculture, livestock operations, which would mean the milk, cream, eggs, and animals, and so forth, but there is no doubt in your mind or in my mind that this present amendment applies to every type of property, because it relates to section 256 which provides that whenever the President or the head of any agency determines that any usable or referable property under the control or in the possession of the agency is surplus to the needs of such agency or any administrative unit thereof it may be sold. On page 7, beginning at line 23, are set out four different methods of disposition. It may be disposed of by sale or lease in the domestic market, by sale or lease to agencies of foreign governments, by sale or lease in foreign markets, but only if such property cannot practicably be disposed of under paragraph (2), and by donation to tax-supported organizations.

I merely want to protect the farmer or livestock man, to give him a chance to bid on this at the highest bid or at the appraised value in competition at any sale on the domestic market, in competition at any sale to any foreign country or giving it to anyone. This is good property that is going to be sold. Just the other day in one of our counties a considerable amount of equipment was sold, property of the C. C. C., particularly tractors, on which just a week before \$250 each had been spent. These tractors were lumped in a group and sold to an eastern firm for \$200 apiece, to my personal knowledge. I just want these farmers to have a chance. They do not have even 40 percent of the 1940 purchases, yet they need 129 percent now. I want them to have a chance to secure these plows, hoes, rakes, tractors, go-devils, or what-not, tires, or anything else.

I am not a farmer and I am not a politician although I have served 18½ years at both. I am not going to tell you that I would rather farm than be in politics; I would not. These farmers are having a hard time. I am asking you to

do only what is right. At least give them a chance to get this equipment they so badly need either by competitive bids or at the appraised value.

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. DONDERO. Does the gentleman's amendment provide for this property to be sold at public or private sale?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. The amendment allows that question to be determined by the President or by the procuring agency. Certainly we ought to give the farmers an opportunity to get this equipment they so badly need.

Mr. DONDERO. Certainly it seems but fair that the farmer should have that opportunity.

Mr. JENSEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I yield.

Mr. JENSEN. And even if some of the equipment is classed as junk, there are many parts of it that could be used for repairs which are very necessary. I certainly hope the gentleman's amendment will be adopted.

Mr. WICKERSHAM. I wish to call the gentleman's attention to the further provisions of the bill which provide for the repair and rehabilitation of this machinery. More of these tractors may be repaired; they may spend \$200 on them and then sell them for \$200. We should extend this help to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Arizona is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, I was going to move to strike out the last word, to get the floor on a pro forma amendment rather than on a real amendment. However, I do have a great deal of interest in the case as presented by my friend from Oklahoma in the amendment of his now pending. I happen to know how farmers and livestock men are in great need of certain iron and steel equipment and I hope any surplus will be made available to them on proper terms. I sought this time, however, for another reason. I am not seeking to amend this bill as it now stands because this, in general, is good legislation; I favor it. We are now trying by it to prevent what occurred following the last World War. We want this vast accumulation of surplus material handled to the best advantage and with the least loss to the Government and to the greatest saving for the taxpayers.

I asked the chairman of the committee a question or two before the bill was read for amendments. There are some other fields of war properties, in my opinion, which should also be safeguarded. Neither of them I find is now covered in the bill, therefore each will have to be the subject of special legislation. In addition to all this machinery and equipment we have produced for war which it is hoped will soon be surplus, we are accumulating large stock piles of war materials in minerals and metals. We must do this. We have not done enough of it to date as a matter of fact and it is

vital to the prosecution of the war. But it stands to reason that at the close of the war there will be some surplus on hand. In order that the mining industry may be safeguarded when peace comes, and our country's welfare also; the Congress ought to give thought now to safeguarding the mining industry, large and small, against the dumping of surplus war minerals and metals at the conclusion of hostilities. Prices of such must not be permitted to be unduly depressed.

There is another matter I wish to mention, not quite in the same category but equally important. Of course, as the chairman said, this bill does not say anything about land belonging to Uncle Sam, formerly used by private individuals but now taken over for war purposes. The value of much of that land has been reduced or changed because of its war use. I hope that the Congress will give adequate thought to the restoration of the value of that part of the public domain now used for war purposes so that at the conclusion of hostilities it may be returned to its former peacetime uses.

Mr. WHITE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MURDOCK. I yield to the gentleman from Idaho.

Mr. WHITE. What does the gentleman advocate doing with all of the surplus Government-owned stock piles of copper and lead after the war?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I want a great reservoir established and held of all strategic and critical minerals so we shall never again be caught lacking. I have just introduced a bill which will take care of that. I was anxious to learn from the chairman of the committee whether this legislation before us brought that subject within the purview of the study of the committee which is being set up. In view of the fact that this bill does not touch that subject, I hope that the Members will give due consideration to the bill which I introduced June 7, H. R. 2895, which does go to that proposition.

Mr. WHITE. The gentleman appreciates there is a deluge of copper, lead, and zinc being poured into this country from foreign countries all over the earth at the present time for war uses?

Mr. MURDOCK. Yes, I understand that fact and I regret that the war made it necessary, but for the protection of our home producers, both large and small, we must look into that matter, too, so that that which has been brought in of necessity during the war from foreign lands will not be the cause of breaking the price of our domestic products.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON].

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to take time on this bill, and I do not expect to discuss the particular amendment that is now before the House, therefore my statement may be subject to a point of order. But I wanted to get into the discussion on the previous amendment which had to do with food surpluses. Seriously, I think that this Congress had better take some immediate action on certain of the regu-

lations of the O. P. A. or we are going to have a food famine in this Nation. I am amazed at the new regulations being issued by the O. P. A.

I have a wire that came in this morning which amazed me. I did not realize how far this agency is going. I am going to read this wire. It is from Girard, Kans., and is dated June 8, reading as follows:

GIRARD, KANS., June 8, 1943.

Representative FRANK CARLSON,

Washington, D. C.:

Office of Price Administration order MPR 401, effective June 10, limiting feed grinders to 50 cents per ton for grinding corn, is absolutely prohibitive and ridiculous. Poultry, hog, and dairy production is heavy here, and if this order stands we will be compelled to shut down our grinders, which will be disastrous to a large number of farmers who depend on our grinding service to keep up their production. Your cooperation needed immediately to get this order rescinded at once in the interest of the war effort.

S. O. FREY,

Manager, Farmers Union Elevator.

This town is not in my congressional district, but, Mr. Chairman, I was amazed to learn that we are controlling out in the farm section the cost per ton for grinding feed. Think of it!

It is about time this Congress does something about the matter or we are going to have a food shortage in this Nation. I am fearful that we will be criticized. We can do something about it and we must do something about it.

I would like to talk about cattle feeding for a moment. If you take a 735-pound steer, put him on feed June 1 for 100 days, selling November 1 to 8, that steer has got to sell for \$16.68 to break even, yet the O. P. A. is trying to maintain a selling price of \$14.50. It is foolish to talk about taxation and enforced savings to drain off this surplus money in the country if we follow that sort of a program. Let us increase our production, let us get some things to sell in this country, let us get rid of all these regulations that are stymieing the production of food in this Nation which in my opinion is going to lead to starvation in this Nation and in our allies.

Mr. MASON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MASON. The gentleman stated that we can do something and we should do something. I do not see what this Congress can do so far as the regulations that are issued by the O. P. A. are concerned. We have no power to reverse those regulations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. DONDERO].

Mr. DONDERO. Mr. Chairman, perhaps what I am about to say may be subject to a point of order, but I do not intend to take the full time allotted me. I take the floor in order to complete the record made by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HOFFMAN].

I was one of the Members who met with the Michigan canners last Saturday. That meeting had to do with the

processing of food. The amendment now pending before the House is also indirectly connected with the subject of food.

The people who work in the canning industry have been classified as farm labor. The average pay of farm labor is about 45 cents an hour. All the canner is asking is that that price be increased to 60 cents an hour; in other words, that they might be permitted to pay 60 cents an hour, which is about one-half what industry is paying people in defense plants. In the face of that situation a good many of these people as a matter of patriotism are willing to stay in the canning factories and do the work at 60 cents an hour.

Do you know that the canners are faced with the proposition that if they are permitted to increase wages 15 cents an hour, they are asked to absorb that and not add it to the price of the product? The result is going to be that unless the canners are allowed to add the additional cost to the selling price there are going to be a great many empty shelves in the grocery stores next fall and a good many people may go hungry. Let the O. P. A. use a little horse sense in the making of its rules, regulations, and price ceilings, and we will have no difficulty. The canning of fruits and vegetables is of vital importance to this country. It is the storage of food for next year.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DONDERO. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Has anyone been able to figure out how the O. P. A. arrives at the rules and the prices they set?

Mr. DONDERO. It is very difficult for me to understand it. It would seem to me that they should acquire in their employment some people who know this subject and know something about it from actual experience rather than those who depend on theory and philosophy.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. WHITTINGTON] for the balance of the time.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Chairman, I hesitate to detain the Committee. Like all members from agricultural districts, I am in sympathy with any legitimate aid that can be rendered the farmers, but I am doubtful about the amendment's giving them the priorities they have under this section without the amendment.

This amendment is to line 9 on page 8. Section 257 states that the property shall, first, be disposed of in the domestic market—the farmers have a right there—and then in the fourth paragraph states that the property may be disposed of by donation to tax-supported institutions, but the property shall be disposed of under this paragraph only if it cannot practicably be disposed of by sale or lease under any of the preceding paragraphs.

My friend from Oklahoma modifies this paragraph. My thought is, with all

due deference, that he may really lose more than is gained, because he can acquire property only under this paragraph, whereas he has a prior right to it under paragraph 1.

Mr. Chairman, I trust the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WICKERSHAM) there were—ayes 35, noes 49.

So the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. BONNER, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that the Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 2795) to amend the Budget and Accounting Act, 1921, to provide for the more efficient utilization and disposition of Government property other than land or buildings and facilities or fixtures appurtenant thereto, and for other purposes, pursuant to House Resolution 248, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments adopted by the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I offer a motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER. Is the gentleman opposed to the bill?

Mr. CHURCH. I am opposed to the bill in its present form, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CHURCH moves to recommit the bill to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments with instructions to that committee to report the same back forthwith with the following amendment: Strike out all of section 4.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the motion to recommit.

The previous question was ordered.

Mr. CHURCH. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were refused.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to recommit.

The motion to recommit was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Mr. WHITTINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members who have spoken on the bill have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. WRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have 5 legislative days in which to file a minority report on the bill regulating the Commodity Credit Corporation and extending its life.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BARRETT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I asked unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record, and include therein an article by Warwick M. Downing. I am advised by the Government Printing Office that the cost is \$126. I ask unanimous consent that the article be printed in the Record, notwithstanding the cost.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today, at the conclusion of the special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an editorial from the Oil City Derrick on grade labeling.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. CLASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a letter I received from the Commissioner of State Aid and Pensions in Massachusetts, and I further ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include some tables which I have secured from the Department of Agriculture.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARLSON of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein extracts from a speech by Mr. Beardsley Ruml at Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAMBLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record in two instances and include therein editorials.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow and also on the succeeding day, at the conclusion of the legislative program and following any special orders heretofore entered, I may be permitted to address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

GEN. HIDINIO MORINGIO, PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF PARAGUAY

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I do this to announce to the House that His Excellency, Gen. Hidinio Moringio, President of the Republic of Paraguay, will be received by the House of Representatives tomorrow at 12:30 p. m. and will address the House of Representatives at that time. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time tomorrow, subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

SUPPLEMENTAL LEND-LEASE APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEFENSE AID

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 2753) making supplemental appropriations to carry out the provisions of an act to promote the defense of the United States, approved March 11, 1941, as amended, and for other purposes, with Senate amendments thereto, disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Chair appointed the following conferees: Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. WOODRUM of Virginia, Mr. LUDLOW, Mr. SNYDER, Mr. O'NEAL, Mr. RABAUT, Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma, Mr. TABER, Mr. WIGGLESWORTH, Mr. LAMBERTSON, and Mr. DITTER.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION OF DISABLED PEOPLE

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 247, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2536) to amend the act entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment," approved June 2, 1920, as amended, and for other purposes.

That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Education, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as shall have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CLARK. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Is it proposed to take this bill up and dispose of it this afternoon?

Mr. CLARK. No; the purpose is just to adopt the rule, on which I understand there will be very little debate.

Mr. RANKIN. It is now almost 5 o'clock.

Mr. CLARK. I do not think this will take more than a few minutes.

Mr. McCORMACK. I can assure the gentleman that there is no intention to go into the general debate today. We will adopt the rule, and the bill will then come up for general debate tomorrow.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, the adoption of this rule will make in order a bill from the Committee on Education dealing with vocational rehabilitation. Before the Committee on Rules the request was unanimous from the Committee on Education and it appears that the bill received a very fine consideration at the hands of the Committee on Education. It was the consensus of opinion in the Committee on Rules that it properly safeguards State rights in the particulars in which the bill operates and I have no objection to the resolution. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER].

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, this bill is on the agenda for today. Everyone knew that the rule was coming up and possibly the bill. No requests for time have been made on the rule. I quite agree with the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina that inasmuch as the committee has asked unanimously for the rule, the matter should be brought up for discussion and I desire to take no more time.

Mr. CLARK. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the resolution to final passage.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BRADLEY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks and include a statement by Luther Harr, Consumers' Counsel of the United States Coal Commission, before a conference in Philadelphia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. MANASCO). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record and include an address by Hon. J. F. O'Connor, of the United States District Court, delivered on Memorial Day at Los Angeles, Calif.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. HÉBERT] is recognized for 15 minutes.

FREEDOM OF SPEECH

Mr. HÉBERT. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that when we entered this war, one of the major rights for which we were fighting was freedom of speech. Can it be that we are winning the war on foreign fronts but losing it right here at home? On May 10, 1942, the United States Supreme Court handed down a decision which seriously threatens the constitutional rights of freedom of speech in the United States. That decision, with the majority opinion written by Justice Frankfurter, gave the Federal Communications Commission absolute authority to tell any radio station in the United States what it may and may not put on the air. From now on, the Federal Communications Commission holds a power over the broadcasting stations of the United States equal to that of any totalitarian government. No bureau in Washington has even been given such unlimited powers as prescribed in this decision. From now on, the licensee of any broadcasting station, whether he operates a 100-watt or a 50,000-watt, had better make sure that the Commission can find nothing about his operation, his personal life, or, possibly, even his wife's hats, that they might criticize.

In 1934 Congress enacted laws which provided for the Federal licensing of radio stations. The purpose of the law, according to those who were instrumental in writing it, was to provide traffic regulations in the field of radio, and nothing else. In order that a standard of regulation might be established, Congress provided that licenses should be issued on the basis of public interest, convenience, and necessity. In 1941 the Federal Communications Commission issued a set of rules generally known as chain broadcasting regulations. These rules went far beyond the regulation of frequencies and very definitely inserted the Government as a third party in the financial and program arrangements between stations and networks. Two of the networks asked for injunctions and the matter was argued in the lower courts and then taken to the Supreme Court. On May 10 the Supreme Court, by a 5-to-2 decision, with Justice Frankfurter writing the majority decision, not only upheld the right of the Commission to put these rules into effect, but went so much further in outlining the Commission's power that the question of the rules themselves has become a very minor matter and instead today the entire right of freedom of speech is threatened on every radio sta-

tion in this country, whether or not it is affiliated with any network. In the decision Justice Frankfurter said:

But the act does not restrict the Commission merely to supervision of the traffic. It puts upon the Commission the burden of determining the composition of that traffic.

In other words, the administration, through the Commission, can tell any radio station what its programs shall or shall not be. Further, in his opinion, Justice Frankfurter stated, in discussing the argument that the Commission is empowered to deal only with the technical and engineering impediments of radio:

We cannot find in the act any such restriction of the Commission's authority.

And he added further:

In the control of the developing problems to which it was directed, the act gave the Commission not niggardly but expansive powers.

One editorial states that the Supreme Court accepts Webster's Unabridged Dictionary as an authority on the definition of words, and in Webster the word "expansive" is defined as "unrestrained." I leave it to you, gentlemen, if this is not the most startling, shocking definition of the rights of our Government to dictate to private industry and private life that has ever been granted in the history of this Nation. Leading members of the bar who have studied the decision of the Supreme Court declare it one of the most dangerous precedents ever established in this country.

As I said before, the great controversy for the past 2 years has been whether or not the so-called chain broadcasting regulations were wise. But today as broadcasters throughout the country study the decision of the Supreme Court, they are horror stricken. The chain rules are forgotten. Today it is a question as to whether or not the Government shall dictate what kind of program we shall have, who shall speak, and on what subjects he shall speak over the broadcasting stations of the United States.

Chairman Fly, of the F. C. C., in a recent press conference, reacted to the anxiety of the radio broadcasting industry much as any other totalitarian leader would. He says that their fears are groundless, and brings up the customary cry of the monopolies. He says that any suggestion that the Government now controls radio is "hokey." He asserts that he aims to free radio stations to conduct their business in a manner in which he, Mr. Fly, thinks best for them. If the stations accept Mr. Fly's protection—if, in other words, they are good children—he assures them that stations certainly have nothing to be afraid of. Is there not a very broad hint there that if they do not play his game there may be something to fear? It is strange that station owners have never sought this freedom that Mr. Fly insists on their accepting, and that they have in the past thrived and improved on their own simple brand of free enterprise.

Broadcasters' fear of imminent Government ownership, control, or domina-

tion is the fear of a reality and not the "hokey" Mr. Fly so lightly calls it. What Hitler did to German radio is a cause for fear in any language, and, according to the Supreme Court, Mr. Fly now has the power to do it even here. Mussolini took the same parental attitude toward his children of the broadcasting industry in Italy. He gave them their instructions just the same as he gave castor oil to some of his less tractable party members. Chairman Fly now has the power to measure out to stations the exact amount of freedom he or the administration wants them to have, either with an eye dropper or a tankard, depending on how he feels at the moment. Perhaps he will choose a carefully measured bottle with a rubber nipple feeding 912 radio stations in the United States the way the Dionne quintuplets were fed, while the stations remain in an infantile relationship to Father Fly.

I hope that every Member of this body will study this decision of the Supreme Court and reflect seriously upon its possibilities. I think that you will agree with me that there is only one way to prevent this serious threat to the freedom of speech and our way of living—that is for Congress to rewrite the Radio Act in such definite terms that it cannot be seized upon by the party in power, no matter what it may be, for the chief purpose of directing its propaganda and maintaining itself in office.

A year ago the Interstate Commerce Committee of this body studied a new radio act known as the Sanders bill. No action was taken but when the new Congress assembled last January, the bill was resubmitted in practically the same form by Representative HOLMES. To date, further hearings have not been held. In the Senate, the White-Wheeler bill, a revision of the 1934 Radio Act, has been introduced by Senator WALLACE WHITE of Maine and Senator BURTON WHEELER of Montana. Hearings on this bill are scheduled to start in the very near future. The bill is of such a nature that it would definitely prescribe the powers of the F. C. C. and free the industry of this life and death threat from the Government which now hangs over it. I feel that this is a matter in which Congress should act at once. We will be derelict in our duty if we continue to let any bureau of the Government assume the powers of Congress—in fact, not only the powers of Congress, but a supreme dictatorship in a matter which so closely affects the lives of every man, woman, and child in this country.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 15 minutes.

BOOMERANG DOLLARS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, every day the war becomes more a struggle not simply of armies and navies but the home front as well.

In enemy countries, where people and resources are strained to the limit, the question is: How long can the home front stand up?

In America, it is a question of how long will it take to make our full strength effective.

This battle of home fronts, which steadily becomes more crucial, is chiefly a struggle to control living cost and prevent inflation.

What is inflation? I have heard quite a number of definitions. Mine is: Inflation is nothing more or less than a sharp rise in prices generated by the pressure of many dollars competing for an inadequate supply of goods. It is a threat today because people have more money at a time when there are less goods for them to buy.

Inflation is not to be taken lightly. Rapidly rising prices could enormously complicate the task of winning the war. They could cause such havoc with our social structure as to cheat us out of the fruits of victory.

It is absolutely necessary, therefore, for the welfare of the people and for the national well-being as a whole, that we hold the line on prices.

We must avoid boomerang dollars.

History shows that large-scale and long-continued military expenditures, financed in ways that give people more, rather than less, money to spend, without a corresponding increase in things to buy, has been the common underlying cause of every serious uncontrolled rise in prices in wartime.

ITALIAN INFLATION NOW

From Italy today come reports indicating history is repeating itself. The Italian people are not only faced with invasion but with a very serious rise in prices. For most things, Italians pay three times as much as before the war. Even rationed foods have gone up 50 percent. Eggs cost 18 cents each. Chicken is around \$1 a pound. A worker pays out \$150 for a suit of clothes.

Skyrocketing prices are a sure sign that the burden of war is falling unevenly and unfairly. This is causing a considerable drain on morale. And a combination of the two has divided the Italian people.

MOBILIZATION OF HOME FRONT

We may well ask ourselves how long will it take to complete the mobilization of our home front to stop scrambling for goods that we do not need; to stop clinging to what we know must be given up?

On that answer, too, depends how long and costly the war will be. It may decide whether the peace is won or lost. Rising prices and wages add needless billions to the cost of war. When peace comes, the bubble of the inflated prices and wages can burst with terrible dislocation to workers, farmers, businessmen—to everyone.

WHAT TOTAL WAR MEANS

Total war demands such a huge amount of goods and services that a major part of our productive capacity must be converted from the production of peacetime goods to producing the materials of war.

In 1940 we spent only \$1 out of \$33 of our national income for war purposes; \$1 out of \$10 in 1941; \$1 out of \$3 in 1942; and according to present estimates we

will spend a little over \$1 out of every \$2 of our national income for our war against the Axis in 1943.

Obviously such a huge diversion of our productive capacity to the war effort requires the conversion of most of our industry to war production. Such a conversion also reduces the amount of available consumer goods. How this works is indicated by the production of various kinds of goods.

In 1939 consumers' goods were valued at \$6,400,000,000. In 1941, based on 1939 prices, they were up two billion over 1939, and during 1942, our first full year of warfare, they tumbled by more than \$3,000,000,000 to \$5,200,000,000.

But as consumer goods values fell, more people began to punch factory time clocks than ever before. They are now working harder and working longer. Moreover, like the supply of goods, the supply of labor also is scarce, so that there is a pressure for the "upping" of salaries, wages, net income for farmers and business.

RESULTS OF UPWARD PRESSURE

Let me attempt to illustrate the results of this upward pressure:

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in durable manufacturing industries were 69.8 cents. In 1942, 94.7 cents.

In 1939 the average hourly earnings in nondurable manufacturing were 58.2 cents. In 1942, 72.3 cents.

Farm wage rates were 104 percent of the 1935-39 average in 1939. They were 158 percent of that average in 1942.

Net corporate profits (before taxes) amounted to five and five-tenths billion dollars in 1939, nineteen and seven-tenths billion dollars in 1942. But net corporate profits after taxes rose from four and two-tenths billion dollars in 1939 to seven and seven-tenths billion dollars in 1941, and then remained comparatively stationary. Thus in 1939 income payment to individuals in this country amounted to \$71,000,000,000; in 1941 to 92 billions; and in 1942 to 116 billions. The estimated income payments in individuals for 1943 is about \$140,000,000,000.

HIGHER TAXES ONLY TAKES PART

Part of the additional income is saved and part is paid in higher taxes; but some is directed to the purchase of goods and services. The expenditures of these additional sums in turn causes a further expansion of income and demands and further pressure on the prices of all products. One reason for the pressure on food prices, for example, is that war workers and others are using their expanded income to bring up their diet to a more adequate level. "They are meat hungry," says Secretary of Agriculture Wickard, "and they have the money to buy the meat."

The increased demand for goods, furthermore, makes necessary additional expenditures by business to replace, repair, and augment productive facilities. These expenditures lead to further pressure on the price structure. Thus the original increase in Government expenditures results in a widespread expansion of demand throughout the economy.

In itself the expansion of demand would not be dangerous. Under ordinary conditions it would be met by increased production of goods. But at the same time that war increases demand for goods, it contracts the supply available to civilians. The reason is apparent: America, for all her vast resources, has not a limitless supply of materials, manpower and machinery. At some point in the development of a war economy more guns mean less butter. The same steel plate cannot be used for both an automobile and a tank; the same sheet of rubber cannot make a tire for both pleasure car and a jeep; the same tanker cannot carry gasoline both to New England and to the global battle fronts.

Civilian production is believed to have reached its peak in August 1941. Since then, although total output has continued to rise, the production of civilian goods has declined at a rate of 1 percent a month, as more productive capacity, labor, plants, and material were diverted to war production.

The effect of war in contracting the supply of things available to civilians is perhaps most clearly seen in connection with production. People realize that there is some limit to the amount of steel or aluminum the Nation can produce. Though it is less evident, war also reduced the supply of available consumer services. In this area manpower is the great bottleneck.

DANGER OF EXPLOSIVE RISE IN PRICES

It is the simultaneous expansion of demand and contraction of supply which creates the danger of an explosive rise in prices. A gap arises between the amount of money people have at their disposal to spend and the amount of goods and services available for them to buy. There is natural tendency for people to compete among themselves to satisfy their individual wants. In effect, they bid against one another competitively for the things which are available.

Of course, not all of the money received by individuals as income is available for spending. Deductions must be made for tax payments and for savings. The size of the gap between supply and demand can obviously be narrowed by raising taxes and encouraging people to save more. The magnitude of the existing gap, however, must not be forgotten. Taxes will absorb only \$15,000,000,000 of an estimated income of \$140,000,000,000. This will leave \$125,000,000,000 at the public's disposal. Another \$25,000,000,000, it is estimated, will be invested in War bonds in 1943. But the people will still have approximately \$100,000,000,000 in their pockets to buy an estimated \$80,000,000,000 worth of goods and services. This is the crux of the economic danger confronting the country.

Unless diverted, the force of these dollars may break through the dam of price control and boil over in widespread bootlegging in violation of both price and rationing control. To draw off these excess dollars will require still higher taxes and some form of compulsory savings. These savings would be drawn out of people's current incomes and returned to them after the war over a

period of years. Realistically, there is no other choice. If excess spending power is not siphoned off, we will destroy not only this spending power but past savings as well, trying vainly to outbid one another for goods and services.

Clearly, the more far reaching are the financial controls to absorb this excess spending, and the more our civilian economy is contracted in favor of war production, the greater becomes the need for assuring people at least their minimum essentials of foods, clothing, shelter, and transportation.

ALL MUST COOPERATE

Price ceilings, of course, contribute to this aim in that they keep prices from skyrocketing beyond the reach of lower-income families.

In his April 1942 speech, President Roosevelt drew a distinction between equality of sacrifice and what he said he preferred to term equality of privilege. This distinction ought to be fixed firmly in all our minds. Too many persons have distorted equality of sacrifice to mean minimum of sacrifice, the attitude of "let the other fellow give up something first." We know what would happen to an army in which every soldier held back until the other man advanced.

To avert that tragedy all of the people must cooperate—every worker, every housewife, every farmer, every manufacturer, every merchant, every minister, every schoolboy. All must fight.

There simply is no such thing as a noncombatant in the battle against rising prices. What each of us buys—what each of us does not buy—affects prices, affects the supplies left for other civilians, affects how much strength is mobilized for war.

Every day, in dozens of actions, in how we shop and what we waste, we either help or hurt the enemy.

Self-restraint must be practiced to keep prices down.

Self-restraint means we must make what we have last longer.

It means foregoing the temporary advantage of higher prices for the things we have to sell.

It means foregoing high wages.

It means that the burden of sacrifice may fall unevenly and that some of us will have to give up more than others. But this is true on the fighting front as well as the home front. All soldiers and sailors are not asked to make the same sacrifices. Some are more fortunate. But all are ready to make any sacrifice which is asked of them.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. PACE, for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. McCORD, for 3 days, on account of official business.

ENROLLED BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. KLEIN, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled a bill and a joint resolution of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2664. An act to provide for the training of nurses for the armed forces, governmental and civilian hospitals, health agencies, and war industries, through grants to institutions providing such training, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 133. Joint resolution to permit additional sales of wheat for feed.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE CIVIL SERVICE

The Committee on the Civil Service will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m. (H. Res. 16), for further investigation and studies of the policies and practices relating to civilian employment in governmental departments. Room 246, old House Office Building.

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

There will be a meeting of the committee at 10:30 a. m. on Thursday, June 10, 1943, for consideration of housing bills.

COMMITTEE ON FLOOD CONTROL

The Flood Control Committee will conduct hearings on flood-control reports submitted by the Chief of Engineers since the passage of the Flood Control Act of August 18, 1941, and on amendments to existing law. Flood-control projects for post-war construction will be among the most satisfactory public works, and the committee plans an adequate backlog of sound flood-control projects available for construction following the war.

1. Thursday, June 10: Representatives of the Department of Agriculture and the Bureau of Reclamation, and other governmental agencies.

2. Friday, June 11: Senators and Representatives of Congress.

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, June 10, 1943, at 10 a. m., on H. R. 2731, to facilitate the award and payment of just compensation for property requisitioned under the authority of section 902 (a) of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, as amended, and for other purposes.

The Subcommittee on Unemployment Insurance of the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will consider in open hearings on Thursday, June 24, 1943, at 10 a. m., committee prints Nos. 1 and 2, dated June 7, 1943, relative to unemployment insurance for merchant seamen.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Securities Subcommittee of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 10 a. m., Thursday, June 10, 1943.

Business to be considered: Open hearing to hear Mr. Ganson Purcell, Chairman of the Securities and Exchange Commission, on proxy rules.

COMMITTEE ON THE POST OFFICE AND POST ROADS

There will be a meeting of Subcommittee No. 7 of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads on Friday, June 11, 1943, at 10 a. m., for the consideration of bills relating to the carrying of mail on star routes. Public hearings will be held.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce at 2 p. m., Monday, June 14, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear representatives of Office of Price Administration. (Hearing for June 9 canceled.)

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Subcommittee No. 1 of the Committee on the Judiciary will conduct hearings on H. R. 2620, a bill to provide for a Delegate from the District of Columbia to the House of Representatives of the United States, and for other purposes, at 10 a. m., on Wednesday, June 16, 1943, in room 346, old House Office Building, Washington, D. C.

COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

There will be a meeting of the Subcommittee on Investigation of Restrictions on Brand Names and Newsprint of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, at 2 p. m., Thursday, June 17, 1943.

Business to be considered: To hear drug witnesses. On Friday, June 18, at 2 p. m. to hear newsprint and paper witnesses.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

473. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in accordance with the provisions contained in the Deficiency Act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), a record of judgments rendered against the Government by the United States district courts as submitted by the Department of Justice through the Treasury Department, and which require an appropriation of \$11,325.26, together with an indefinite appropriation to pay interest (H. Doc. No. 225); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

474. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of a vessel of the United States Coast Guard, in the sum of \$832.83, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of June 15, 1936 (14 U. S. C. 71), and which require an appropriation for payment (H. Doc. No. 226); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

475. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1884 (5 U. S. C. 266), an estimate of appropriation for payment of certain claims allowed by the General Accounting Office, amounting to \$5,857.99, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in

the first column of the attached schedule (H. Doc. No. 227); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

476. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a proposed provision relating to a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims, as follows: "For the payment of judgment No. 45047 rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Herman E. Osann covering a claim under the Exchange Relief Act of March 26, 1934, \$3,784.64, to be paid from the administrative expense fund, Office of Alien Property Custodian" (H. Doc. No. 228); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

477. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with the provisions of the act of September 30, 1890 (31 U. S. C. 226), and the act of April 27, 1904 (31 U. S. C. 583, par. 2), a schedule of judgments rendered by the Court of Claims which have been submitted by the Treasury Department and require an appropriation for their payment, amounting to \$232,578.66 (H. Doc. No. 229); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

478. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation submitted by the Navy Department to pay claims for damages by collision or damages incident to the operation of vessels of the Navy, in the sum of \$10,628.05, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (34 U. S. C. 599), and which require an appropriation for their payment (H. Doc. No. 230); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

479. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Treasury Department for the fiscal year 1944, amounting to \$4,500,000 (H. Doc. No. 231); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

480. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting in compliance with section 2 of the act of July 7, 1834 (5 U. S. C. 266), a schedule of claims amounting to \$738,176.55, allowed by the General Accounting Office, as covered by certificates of settlement the numbers of which are shown in the first column of said schedule under appropriations, the balances of which have been carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 20, 1874 (31 U. S. C. 713), and for the services of the several departments and independent offices (H. Doc. No. 232); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

481. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimates of appropriations submitted by the several executive departments and independent offices to pay claims for damages to privately owned property, in the sum of \$71,116.21, which have been considered and adjusted under the provisions of the act of December 28, 1922 (31 U. S. C. 215), and which require appropriations for their payment (H. Doc. No. 233); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

482. A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting a letter from the Chief of Engineers, United States Army, dated November 13, 1942, submitting a report, together with accompanying papers, on a preliminary examination and survey of San Lorenzo Creek and its tributaries, California, authorized by the Flood Control Act approved on August 28, 1937; to the Committee on Flood Control.

483. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior; to the Committee on Patents.

484. A letter from the Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of a proposed bill

to suspend, as respects vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, certain provisions of the act approved March 3, 1925, authorizing suits against the United States in admiralty for damage caused by and salvage services rendered to public vessels of the United States, and to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to settle and pay claims for damages caused by vessels of the Navy or in the naval service, or for towage and salvage services to such vessels, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

485. A letter from the Director, Selective Service System, transmitting a list of registrants who have been deferred for occupational reasons because of their employment in or under the Federal Government on May 15, 1943; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MASON: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2456. A bill for the relief of Moses Tennenbaum; without amendment (Rept. No. 530). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LANDIS:

H. R. 2907. A bill to provide for flood-control work on the Wabash River and its tributaries; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2908. A bill to amend Public Law 537, Seventy-seventh Congress, approved May 2, 1942; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 2909. A bill to provide for the acquisition and maintenance of suitable accommodations for Capitol pages; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. R. 2910. A bill to establish community and county committees of farmers to administer those phases of all Federal programs involving farm contact; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WILLEY:

H. R. 2911. A bill to extend the time during which the 90-percent credit against Federal unemployment taxes for contributions paid into State unemployment funds may be claimed and allowed; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2912. A bill to authorize the charging of tolls for the passage or transit of Government traffic over the Golden Gate Bridge; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HAYS:

H. R. 2913. A bill providing emergency credit for farmers whose crops were damaged or destroyed by floods in 1943; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. McKENZIE:

H. R. 2922. A bill to further amend the act of June 25, 1938, entitled "An act extending the classified civil service to include postmasters of the first, second, and third classes, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. VOORHIS of California:

H. J. Res. 135. Joint resolution directing the Administrator of the Office of Price Administration to institute a system of grade labeling of all canned food products; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. FULBRIGHT:

H. Con. Res. 24. Concurrent resolution declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANKIN:

H. Res. 255. Resolution for the consideration of H. R. 2703; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2914. A bill for the promotion of Capt. Richard S. Field, United States Navy, retired; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 2915. A bill for the relief of the Pacific Construction Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MAHON:

H. R. 2916. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Winnie O'Dell Singleton and Jimmie Dale Singleton, minor; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROGERS of California:

H. R. 2917. A bill for the relief of Sallie Grossenbacher; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 2918. A bill for the relief of the city of Battle Creek, Mich.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WINSTEAD:

H. R. 2919. A bill for the relief of Michael Eatman, Jr., and Mrs. Michael Eatman, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2920. A bill for the relief of the estate of Mrs. Earl B. Burkes; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. WICKERSHAM:

H. R. 2921. A bill for the relief of Eddie Bessire; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

1474. By Mr. ANGELL: Petitions of certain citizens of Portland, Oreg., asking for the enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1475. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of 99 members of the First Baptist Church of Big Spring, Tex., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1476. Also, petition of Rev. Lawrence White and 62 citizens of Defiance, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1477. Also, petition of Ida Lewis and 20 citizens of Costa Mesa, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1478. Also, petition of Estelle Harper and 182 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging

enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1479. Also, petition of E. R. Hackett, and 60 citizens of Phoenix, Ariz., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1480. Also, petition of Eleanor M. Clark and 80 citizens of Ontario, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1481. Also, petition of the Amy Baptist Church of Amy, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1482. Also, petition of 44 members of the First Baptist Church of Berkeley, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1483. Also, petition of Mr. and Mrs. Tom Tabor and 112 citizens of Oden, Ark., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1484. Also, petition of Alma E. Killus and 40 citizens of Los Angeles, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1485. Also, petition of Mrs. J. H. Flewell and 60 citizens of Long Beach, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1486. Also, petition of George H. Bauerle and 23 citizens of Nampa, Idaho, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1487. Also, petition of J. B. Abbott and 37 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and

speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1488. Also, petition of Rev. A. H. Bauknight and 27 members of the Victor Methodist Church of Greer, S. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1489. Also, petition of Georgia G. Richmond and 28 citizens of Coquille, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1490. Also, petition of Lillian Nelson and 23 citizens of Chicago, Ill., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1491. Also, petition of 64 citizens of the District of Columbia, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1492. Also, petition of Mrs. L. M. Van Nest and 34 citizens of Vallejo, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1493. Also, petition of Mrs. Charles Brooks and 36 citizens of Roosevelt, Minn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1494. Also, petition of Ray F. Brown and eight citizens of Mill Creek, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1495. Also, petition of George L. Beardsley and 40 citizens of Garden Grove, Calif., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1496. Also, petition of J. R. West and 38 citizens of Miami, Fla., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed pro-

duction of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1497. Also, petition of Mrs. S. Fred Christman and 100 citizens of Cumberland, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1498. Also, petition of Elma Wood and 104 citizens of Wilmington, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1499. Also, petition of Lottie E. Bartshe and 26 citizens of Ithaca, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1500. Also, petition of the Joseph K. Alston Camp No. 7, United Spanish War Veterans, signed by F. N. Wakefield, committee man, and Rev. J. A. Anderson, commander, of Greenville, S. C., voicing disapproval and expressing condemnation of the attitude of John L. Lewis and urging Congress to enact necessary laws to handle Lewis and his kind; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1501. Also, petition of Mrs. Forrest Lomnick and members of the Central Methodist Church, of Newberry, S. C., urging that the Farm Security Administration under its present leadership be continued and that funds for its operation be appropriated by Congress in an amount sufficient to extend its activities to all farm families needing the kind of help which it provides; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1502. By Mr. CARTER: Petition of Dorris W. Stiles and 33 other residents of Hayward, Calif., urging the enactment of House bill 2082, the Bryson bill, prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1503. Also, petition of Mrs. John R. George, and 20 other residents of Martinez, Calif., prohibiting the manufacture or sale of alcoholic liquors during the war period; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1504. By Mr. HAYS: Petition of the Arkansas State Highway Commission, endorsing the executive committee formula for the apportionment of funds for highway construction; to the Committee on the Public Roads.

1505. Also, petition of the Arkansas-Missouri Ginners' Association, urging speedy passage of House bill 2400; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1506. By Mr. JONKMAN: Petition of Mrs. William A. Rogers and 50 other residents of Sparta, Mich., recommending passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1507. By Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON: Petition of Luther Pearson, county superintendent, Brazos County, Bryan, Tex., and Mrs. J. L. Brock, Bryan, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1508. Also, petition of G. C. Boswell, of Ranger, Tex., and Ralph Campbell, president of the Junior Chamber of Commerce, of

Austin, Tex., favoring appropriation for National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1509. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Reclamation Board of the State of California, Sacramento, Calif., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to appointing J. LEROY JOHNSON to the House Committee on Flood Control; to the Committee on Flood Control.

1510. Also, petition of the Ironwood Chamber of Commerce, Ironwood, Mich., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the National Youth Administration; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1511. Also petition of sundry citizens of the State of Nebraska, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1512. Also, petition of the Pan American Union, of Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to Pan American Day; to the Committee on Rules.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JUNE 10, 1943

(Legislative day of Monday, May 24, 1943)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

Dr. Horace E. Cromer, district superintendent of the Methodist Church, offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, Spiritual Father to all men, Arbiter of the destiny of the nations of the whole earth, it is just and needful that we renew with each new dawn our allegiance to Thee and to Thy will. This we pause to do. We seek Thy guidance, Thy way, and Thy purposes for this day. Make us to know that which is right in Thy sight.

Let the blessing of our Father God rest on each of us here assembled, all those whom we represent, the men of our far-flung national forces, the leaders of the nations, and all men. We ask in Jesus' name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Wednesday, June 9, 1943, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Alken	Caraway	Hatch
Andrews	Chandler	Hawkes
Austin	Chavez	Hayden
Bailey	Clark, Mo.	Hill
Ball	Connally	Holman
Bankhead	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.
Barbour	Davis	La Follette
Bilbo	Eastland	Langer
Bone	Ellender	Lodge
Brewster	Ferguson	Lucas
Bridges	George	McCarran
Buck	Gerry	McClellan
Burton	Gillette	McFarland
Bushfield	Green	McKellar
Byrd	Guffey	McNary
Capper	Gurney	Maloney

Maybank	Revercomb	Vandenberg
Mead	Reynolds	Van Nuys
Millikin	Russell	Wallgren
Moore	Scruggam	Walsh
Murdoch	Shipstead	Wheeler
Murray	Smith	Wherry
Nye	Stewart	White
O'Daniel	Taft	Wiley
O'Mahoney	Thomas, Okla.	Willis
Overton	Thomas, Utah	Wilson
Pepper	Tobey	
Radcliffe	Tunnell	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] are absent from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. DOWNEY] is absent on official business for the Committee on Military Affairs.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] is absent on official business for the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. CLARK] and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained on important public business.

The Senator from New York [Mr. WAGNER] is necessarily absent.

Mr. McNARY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BUTLER] are members of the congressional committee attending the funeral of the late Representative Guyer, and are therefore necessarily absent from the city.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. BROOKS], and the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. ROBERTSON] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following communication and letters, which were referred as indicated:

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATES FOR THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT (S. Doc. No. 64)

A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting supplemental estimates of appropriations for the Department of the Interior, fiscal year 1944, in the amount of \$17,285,000, in the form of amendments to the Budget for that fiscal year (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

COMPENSATION FOR USEFUL SUGGESTIONS OR INVENTIONS BY PERSONNEL OF THE INTERIOR DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide equitable compensation for useful suggestions or inventions by personnel of the Department of the Interior (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Lands and Surveys.

MORE ADEQUATE AND UNIFORM ADMINISTRATIVE PROVISIONS IN VETERANS' LAWS PERTAINING TO COMPENSATION, AND SO FORTH

A letter from the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide more adequate and uniform administrative provisions in veterans' laws pertaining to compensation, pension, and retirement pay payable by the Veterans' Administration, and for other purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Finance.

MARCH 1943 REPORT OF RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting, pursuant to law, a confidential report of the Corporation for the month of March 1943, relating to loan and other authorizations (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

TRANSFERS AND REDUCTIONS OF PERSONNEL IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE

A letter from the President of the United States Civil Service Commission, transmitting, pursuant to Senate Resolution 84 (78th Congress), a summary table of reports for the month of April 1943 (including all replies received in the Commission through May 29, 1943) submitted by the various executive departments and agencies; also a separate list of those agencies from which no reports, or from which only partial or incomplete reports were received (with accompanying papers); ordered to lie on the table.

PETITIONS

Petitions, etc., were presented, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. BILBO:

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of the so-called Bryson bill (H. R. 2082) to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A petition of sundry citizens of Jackson and vicinity, in the State of Mississippi, praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

A petition of sundry citizens, members of St. Peter's Evangelical and Reformed Church, of Inman, Kans., praying for the enactment of Senate bill 860, relating to the sale of alcoholic liquors to the members of the land and naval forces of the United States; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of a committee were submitted:

By Mr. TUNNELL, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 159. A bill to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the United States Parcel Post Building Company, of Cleveland, Ohio; with amendments (Rept. No. 301), and

S. 346. A bill for the relief of Harriet B. Rickords; without amendment (Rept. No. 302).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 254. A bill for the relief of Edward Gilman; with an amendment (Rept. No. 303).

By Mr. WILSON, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 462. A bill for the relief of Primo Giordanengo and Angie Giordanengo; with an amendment (Rept. No. 304); and

S. 1090. A bill for the relief of John Henry Miller, Junior; without amendment (Rept. No. 307).

By Mr. WILEY, from the Committee on Claims:

S. 1038. A bill for the relief of Verna Mae Rossell and Winifred Rossell; with amendments (Rept. No. 305).

By Mr. O'DANIEL, from the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 575. A bill for the relief of Peter Cuccio and Violet Cuccio; without amendment (Rept. No. 306).